

Iranian Studies
Journal of The Society for Iranian Studies

**Persian Sufism
in Its Historical
Perspective**

by
A. H. Zarrinkoob

Summer~Autumn 1970 Volume III Numbers 3 and 4

The Society for Iranian Studies

COUNCIL

Amin Banani
University of California at Los Angeles

Ali Banuazizi
Boston College

James A. Bill
University of Texas at Austin

Jerome W. Clinton
University of Minnesota

Richard W. Cottam
University of Pittsburgh

Farhad Kazemi, Executive Secretary
New York University

Kenneth A. Luther
University of Michigan

Jacqueline W. Mintz
New Haven, Connecticut

Ann T. Schulz, ex officio, Treasurer
University of New Hampshire

Majid Tehranian
Tehran, Iran

IRANIAN STUDIES

Ali Banuazizi, Editor
Jerome W. Clinton, Associate Editor
Jacqueline W. Mintz, Associate Editor
Sharon Stilo, Editorial Assistant

Iranian Studies

Journal of The Society for Iranian Studies

Volume III

Summer-Autumn 1970

Numbers 3-4

CONTENTS

136 NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

137 FOREWORD

Amin Banani

139 PERSIAN SUFISM IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

by Abdol-Hosein Zarrinkoob

NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

Since the inception of Iranian Studies three years ago, one of our primary objectives has been to present the work of Iranian scholars on the various facets of Persian studies. Perhaps in no other area of scholarship has the contribution of Persian researchers been more prodigious and significant than in the field of Islamic philosophy and culture. Ironically, however, this is an area in which their work has received only scant recognition in the West. It is thus a great and timely privilege for our journal to be able to present an outstanding example of this scholarship in its current issue.

Professor Abdol-Hosein Zarrinkoob, one of Iran's foremost historians and literary critics, is currently on the Faculties of Theology and Letters of Tehran University. His prolific publications include Tārīkh-i Iran ba'd az Islam (History of Iran after Islam), Du Qarn Sukūt (Two Centuries of Silence), Bā Kārāvan-i Hullah (With a Caravan of Silk), Naqd-i Adabī (Literary Criticism), Arzish-i Mīrāth-i Sūfīyyah (An Evaluation of the Legacy of Sufism), Shi'r-i bī Durūgh, Shi'r-i bī Niqāb (Poetry without Falsehood, Poetry without Mask), and most recently, Az Kūchah-i Rindān (From the Street of the Debauched). The present essay, "Persian Sufism in its Historical Perspective," is based on a series of lectures delivered by Professor Zarrinkoob at Princeton and the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1969-1970.

Ali Banuazizi

FOREWORD

Professor Abdol-Hosein Zarrinkoob is one of the few creative scholars of Islamic humanities who has achieved a happy resolution between a prodigious traditional education and a critical approach and method in his works. His writings are the results of penetrating original research and synthesis of current scholarship. Of the several fields in which he has attained eminence none is of wider and more timely interest to his western readers than the history of mysticism in Islam.

As modern man experiences with growing bitterness and deepening anguish the fragmentation of his own being and his alienation from all that surrounds him, the seeming wholeness of another era beckons to him with increasing allure. The focus upon the primacy of the spiritual dimension in man, which enabled the Sufis to overcome their sense of separation with exuberant joy, reenters into the vision of our time. The recapturing of our spiritual potential depends upon awareness of ourselves. Yet as the history of Sufism illustrates the line between self-awareness and self-delusion is very thin and elusive. The fundamental difference between a "God-intoxicated" Sufi like Rūmī and a mystic-enamored representative of our generation is that while the former strove to "annihilate" his self, the latter asserts his. But we note also the large number of Sufis who travelled the circular path to selflessness and arrived at self-indulgence.

Professor Zarrinkoob's overview suggests a basic turning point in the history of Sufism from a spontaneous, vital and creative epoch to an institutionalized, dogmatized and sterile phase. He is, of course, the first to avow that his overview is from a Persian vantage point. If we consider the seldom refuted assertion that the most sublime and enduring expressions of Islamic mysticism are to be found in Persian poetry, then we may also note a correlation between the end of the creative epoch of Sufism and the decline of classical Persian poetry.

It is a signal honor and a landmark achievement for Iranian Studies to devote this special issue to publication of Professor

Zarrinkoob's lectures on the history of Sufism. Those of us who were privileged to witness the genuineness of his humanity and experience the warmth of his personality while hearing these lectures are doubly grateful to have them in publication and to share them with all who are interested in Iranian culture.

Amin Banani
University of California,
Los Angeles

Persian Sufism in Its Historical Perspective

by
A. H. Zarrinkoob

PREFACE

The eight sections of the present essay are drawn from the lectures I delivered at Princeton University and at the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1969-1970. Because of the diverse nature of the audience I did not go into the details that would be necessary in a new approach to a traditional problem. Instead, my principal aim was to present a brief sketch of the contents of what may be called Persian mysticism, while showing at the same time the remarkable role that this variety of Islamic mysticism has played in the cultural development of Persia.

The origins of Sufism--as Islamic mysticism is generally called--presents a very controversial problem indeed, but that Persia was the cradle of early Sufism is beyond doubt. Moreover, if mysticism is taken to be--as it usually is--an expression of man's belief in direct connection with the godhead, the well-known ethical concepts of the Zoroastrians--for whom every particular deed of daily life, good or bad, is the joint product of man and either the principle of Good or of Evil--might also be considered as unconscious expressions of a pantheistic type of mysticism. Thus, while a series of social, religious, and political interactions occurring in the late Sasanian period prepared Zoroastrian minds for a new faith introduced by the Muslim conquest of Persia, the converted Zoroastrians of the early Islamic period were able to retain some of their former ethical tenets in the Sufi philosophy.

Sufi philosophy found a most hospitable soil in the domain of Persian poetry. The Persian poetry of classical times was so

extensively influenced by Sufi philosophy that almost every great lyric poet of that period was a Sufi, as nearly every great Sufi of the time was a poet. Indeed, the influence of Sufism on Persian poetry was so considerable that if the Sufi poets had not appeared on the literary stage, Persian literature would have remained for long centuries no more than a court literature limited to a panegyric character. It was in the works of Sanā'i, Ḥaṭṭār, and Rūmī that the oppressed classes were finally given a voice in literature, and social injustice, on which hardly a word could be uttered by a court-poet, was sharply criticized in the bons mots of the "wise fools" (dīvanigān-i āqil), who figured as heroes in a number of the tales of the Sufi poets.

The role of Sufi orders in the development of social ethics was by no means of lesser importance. Attempts at reform were also undertaken by various groups of Sufis. Although these were of no single character, the socio-political movements of the Sarabadarīs and the Safavids represent outstanding examples. Finally, the well-known system of Persian chivalry, called javānmardī, and its traditional rules of athleticism have remarkable links with the Sufi tradition.

Such a diverse set of problems must be treated in any outline of Persian mysticism, no matter how brief. Unfortunately, however, lack of time did not permit me to discuss a number of questions that are of importance in the development of Persian Sufism. Although there exists a considerable number of Western contributions on the Sufi heritage of Persia, this short essay may be of interest in that it offers, at least on certain particular questions, a Persian point of view.

Abdol-Hosein Zarrinkoob
Los Angeles
June 1970

I

Opinions differ on the origin of Islamic mysticism, but that Persia was one of its earliest cradles cannot be questioned. At the time of the emergence of Islam in the Near East, Mesopotamia and Khurasan were the two windows through which the fresh air of ideas could penetrate the fenced enclosure that was the Sasanian Empire--Hellenistic ideas and Semitic religions through northern Mesopotamia, and Indian and Chinese influences through Khurasan.

In the decades immediately before the Muslim Arabs appeared at the gates of the Sasanian Kingdom, Greek Neo-Platonists, banished from the Byzantine Empire in 529 A.D., had found refuge in the Sasanian Court, for the famous Medical Academy of Jundīshāpūr had been for a considerable time an active center for the medical sciences--including those of the Hellenistic tradition. The Medical Academy was probably founded in the late third or fourth century of the Christian era, and from the fifth century unto early Islamic times, it served as a refuge for the Nestorians driven from Edessa in 489 A.D.

Elements of the Chinese and Indian cultures--including a few Indian books and elements of Chinese Buddhism--had also crossed the eastern and northern frontiers of Khurasan in early Sasanian times. The origin of the story of Barlaam, introduced at that time, may be found in such eastern sources. The state religion of the Sasanian Empire, especially toward its final days, was Zoroastrianism, sometimes in Zurvanite form. Zurvanism tended to be monotheistic and, despite its temporary predominance in the third century, was generally regarded as a heresy by orthodox Zoroastrian priests. Communities of Jews and Christians enjoyed religious freedom, but Christianity was not strong enough at that time to replace Zoroastrianism, even if Islam had not appeared there.

Zoroastrian priests were cruelly zealous about persecuting heretics and putting down what they called "bad-faith" or heretical tendencies. The execution of Mani and the persecution of the followers of Mazdak for which the Sasanian government has often been accused, comprise only a part of these priests' anti-heretical activities. A well-known high priest of early Sasanian times, Mobad Kartir, has described his own anti-heretical exploits in a famous inscription on the so-called Kaa'ba of Zoroaster, near Persepolis.¹ With much joy and pride, this high priest of the early Sasanians relates in this Pahlavi inscription how he has succeeded in expelling Jewish, Christian, Buddhist, and Brahman monks, together with other non-Iranians of "bad-faith," from within the Empire.

Nevertheless, there was a turmoil in the consciences of some of the elite concerning religious problems. The case of Salmān-i Fārsī may be considered illustrative of this religious crisis. This holy man, in whom early mystics of Persia later found a forerunner of Sufism, was a Persian Zoroastrian of the late Sasanian period. According to the Islamic legend, the quest for a new faith led this Zoroastrian youth to adopt Christianity, took him later to Syria and then to Medina, where he became a fervent Muslim and a faithful companion to Muhammad.

The same religious crisis may have affected the conscience of a physician of King Anushiravan named Burzoe, who had perhaps been influenced by exposure to Manichean or Buddhist thought. He has described his own religious crisis and the perplexity of his generation concerning religious matters in a preliminary chapter of his Pahlavi translation of the Indian fables of Bidpay.

Although Burzoe is supposed to have been a vizier to the Sasanian King and Salmān a wandering monk, and though Salmān was a companion of Muhammad and the physician Burzoe a contemporary of Muhammad's father, both nevertheless are believed to have lived in the same religious milieu and to have undergone nearly the same crisis of conscience. In the few decades just prior to the advent of Islam, others like them became receptive to Christian teachings in Mesopotamia, and to Buddhist practices in Khurasan.

The greater part of Mesopotamia had not only been the site of the Persian metropolis of Ctesiphon, over several centuries in pre-Islamic times, but also the arena of some of the most important political and social events in Persian history. Even the modern name of the area, Iraq, is probably a loan word from the Pahlavi Erag, meaning low-land or south-land. It corresponded to

the Sasanian province of Suristan, which was considered the heart of Eranshahr (*dil-i Irānshahr*). While this western portion of the Sasanian Empire was influenced by the Semitic and Greek worlds, its eastern sector, the larger satrapy of Khurasan, was a conjunction of Chinese, Indian, and Iranian cultures. Toward the end of the Sasanian Empire, the heart of Eranshahr was undergoing a religious and intellectual crisis. Controversial theological works by Zoroastrian priests such as the *Dēnkart* and *Škand Gumānik Vičār*, even though belonging to later periods, clearly reveal the seriousness of the religious turmoil within the Zoroastrian community in late Sasanian times. Faced with the turmoil and disorder of the late Sasanian period, the Zoroastrian hierarchy was in a perpetual struggle against all that was felt to be "bad-faith" or of a heretical tendency.

While Zoroastrianism and Christianity were engaged in a latent struggle for supremacy, Manichaeism, which had been expelled as a dangerous heresy from Persia proper, found refuge in Egypt and Transoxania. As a matter of fact, the spread of Manichaeism in Transoxania was such that in 732 A.D. the edict of a Chinese emperor, Huan-Tsung, considered "the teaching of Lord Mani" as "the internal religion of western Barbarians," which were none other than the Iranians of Transoxania.²

Some kind of mysticism, of course, could be found in most of the religions then in vogue in the Persian world. Generally speaking, mysticism is an attempt to attain direct and personal communication with the godhead. Therefore, mystical experience is perhaps as old as humanity and is not confined to any race or religion. If this definition of mysticism can be accepted--and it seems as good a starting point as any--then one would be justified in finding in the Central Asian shamans the forerunners of Christian and Muslim mystics.

Until recent times, among some inhabitants of northeast Asia the shaman was a type of medicine-man, combining certain functions of priest and doctor, who was believed to have the authority to employ or persuade the spirits to serve his purposes, for instance, to leave the body of a sick man. The ceremonies and rituals of these medicine-men as described by W. Radloff³ in the late nineteenth century, represent the painful endeavor of the shaman to communicate with the godhead. The ecstatic trances of the shaman, produced by means of religious dances, reveal a rough kind of mystical experience. It is no wonder then that the shaman occurs so

often in Persian Sufi and even profane literature as an example of a fervent worshipper in non-Muslim lands with whom Persian poets may have been acquainted.⁴

The mystery of Mithra offers one of the most ancient examples of a mystical religious cult of Iran. Though some scholars have refused to identify the Iranian Mithra with the Mithra that is depicted in the mystery, the name itself is strongly suggestive of its Iranian origin. The seven grades through which the initiate in this cult had to pass symbolized the passage of his soul through the seven heavens to the abode of Light--apparently a forestate of mystical union with the Divine. Mithraism is believed to have some influence on the early Christianity, to which it later became the most popular rival in the Roman World.

While it is true that Zoroaster himself cannot reasonably be viewed as the type of mystical shaman that H.S. Nyberg⁵ has sought to find in him,⁶ his teachings nevertheless do not lack mystical elements. Zoroaster's central theme was the dualism of good and evil, the dualism of light and dark. According to his teachings, man is free to choose between good and evil in the battle between these two powers in the present world; if he chooses the good, his good work will enlarge and strengthen the realm of good, and vice versa. Zoroastrianism maintains that Ahriman, the God of Darkness, and Ormazd, the God of Light, are competing for the control of the world, and man's free will consists of his having the option of helping the one or the other. The dualistic distinction that Zoroaster made between the sources of good and evil is extended by Mani to hold between the natural and the supernatural, and between the soul and the body.

Although this dualism is perhaps not rationally justified, yet the distinctions that we make between good and bad, intelligence and matter, and the like seem to demand an explanation that cannot be given by strict monism. In fact, religious dualism often emerges as an answer to the problem of evil in a belief system that assumes one good and omnipotent God; it is an attempt to answer the question as to why everything in the world does not go according to the will of this creator and ruler.⁷

Zoroaster's mysticism is inherent in his view of the relationship with Ormazd and is based on personal endeavor against the devil. The essence of his teachings, in which man's good work is considered his contribution to the construction of a better world, is a degree

of personal communication with the godhead. It is not, however, for this particular reason that some scholars of past generations have sought to find the origin of Muslim Sufism in Zoroastrianism. Although Zoroastrianism refuses to consider the soul apart from the body, or the external apart from the temporal, it nevertheless maintains that existence begins as a duality and ends in a unity,⁸ and this is almost the same philosophical conclusion that the Muslim mystic poet ^cAṭṭār (d. 1220) reaches in his Parliament of Birds (Manṭiq al-Ṭayr).

The journey into heaven and hell depicted so differently by al-Ma^ccarrī, Sanā'ī, and Dante may have its oldest pattern in a similar description by a Zoroastrian priest, Ardāy Wīrāz Nāmag. The very concept of paradise and hell set forth in the vast Zoroastrian literature is in itself essentially mystical. The final passage of the righteous soul to the sublime abode of good, the vision of God which is the greatest joy of heaven, is a real mystical realization in Zoroastrianism.

Ardāy Wīrāz, whose journey into the realms of heaven and hell has been described in the Pahlavi book bearing his name, is to be regarded as the type of Zoroastrian holy man-mystic. His emergence into the presence of the All Highest, as the end of his journey, is a mystical experience, which he reports thus: "When Ormazd spoke in his manner, he said, 'I was astonished; for I saw a light, but no body did I see. A voice I heard, and I knew that this was Ormazd.'"⁹ This reminds one of the description of the ascension of the Muslim Bāyezīd of Bisṭām.

A gnostic component in Manichaeism gives this kind of Persian dualism a more visible mark of mysticism. The gnosticism of the early Christian centuries, which was by no means a single, organized movement but a syncretism of kindred tendencies emanating from different sources, considered the world of matter, including man's body, the creation of an evil deity; it sought the deliverance of the soul by religious and mystical rites and expected its realization through the coming of a special emissary of light.

Mani, the prophet of Manichaeism, presented himself as this emissary of light.¹⁰ His teachings survived him and spread with amazing rapidity westward and eastward in the civilized world. Manichaeism, in whose origins scholars like H.C. Puech have found mystical gnosis rather than theological knowledge, expresses a kind of dualistic mysticism, based on a secret gnosis that is supposed to lead to the rescue of light from darkness--the final salvation.¹¹ As a matter of fact, gnosticism is supposed to have arisen out of

the debate over the question of evil: when the gnostic man finds his world surrounded by evil, he feels himself to be alien and a prisoner in such a world; he thus feels a nostalgia for a world of light and revolts against the dark one.

For the Manichaeism, the material principle and everything that emanates from it is considered essentially evil. The soul, being a fragment of the godhead, a spark of divine fire, is imprisoned in the body, and its rescue is to be attained by gnosis, which is co-natural with the soul to the point of identity. Thus, Manichaeism, being a gnostic type of religion, may be defined as a mysticism of transformation, in which knowledge brings immediate and definitive liberation of rebirth into light.¹² Like other kinds of gnosis, the gnosis that was supposed to underlie Manichean teachings consisted of a knowledge that was not a mental acquisition arrived at through the exercise of observation and reason so much as mystical enlightenment received by the supernatural process of revelation. This feature of Manichaeism is to be seen in those Manichaean literary works that have been preserved. In the Manichaean hymn-cycles in Parthian, for example, there sometimes runs a strong mystical theme.¹³ The crude ascetism of this "Apostle of Light" considered man's soul to be imprisoned by his body, to be finally rescued in death.

One is tempted to compare this teaching of Mani with what the Muslim Sufis call annihilation. The same concept is also of great importance in the teachings of Buddha. In fact, what Manichaeism had to struggle against in Transoxania and eastern Khurasan at that time was the continuous advance of the teachings of Buddha, the spread of which into Khurasan probably dates from pre-Sasanian times. An early Sasanian governor of this province, Peroz, who was a son of Ardashir Papakan, the founder of the Sasanian dynasty, apparently deemed it necessary to call himself a Mazda worshipper and a Buddhist at the same time.¹⁴

Nevertheless by the end of the Sasanian period, when a Chinese pilgrim, Hsuan Tsang (602-664 A.D.), was visiting the area, the religion of Buddha had been to some extent driven from the region of the North Oxus to the south.¹⁵ Even in early Islamic times there was a market in Bukhara, the Bāzār-i Mākh, where idols representing the Buddha were sold.¹⁶ The Persian word but, indicating idol in general, probably finds its origin in this context. Moreover, the glittering Balkh, the Balkh-i Bāmīk, on the south side of the Oxus remained a holy place for Buddhist pilgrims of the east for a long time.

The word Buddh or Buddha as used by such Muslim writers as al-Bīrūnī, Mas'ūdī, and al-Shahristānī, means the founder of Buddhism, the Sakyamuni, who was born about 560 B.C. in the foothills of the Himalayas, and preached the so-called Nirvana as the way of deliverance (mukshā).

Al-Shahristānī's description of Budis'ya,¹⁷ the rank of the men who seek the path of truth, as attained by, for example, patience, renunciation of the world, and abstention from wordly desires, reminds us of what, at a later time, the Sufis considered ascetic ideals. Thus, the ascetic life, intuitive gnosis, and ecstatic experiences so essential in Sufism were already known, more or less, in pre-Islamic Persia.

Moreover, esoteric interpretation of revelation, so highly appreciated by the Muslim Sufis, also had a parallel in pre-Islamic Persia.¹⁸ Certain features of the Muslim use of allegorical interpretation may be traced to the influence of Philo-Judaeus (ca. 20 B.C. - 50 A.D.) and other scholars of Alexandria.¹⁹

This method of Qur'anic exegesis was viewed with abhorrence by Islamic orthodoxy, and considered dangerous and tending toward zandaqa or heresy. This term was widely used in Muslim criminal law to describe the heretic whose teaching was potentially dangerous to the state, and was borrowed in Iraq from the vocabulary of the Sasanian administration, and is thought to derive from the Sasanian Zandīk, which referred to those who based their teaching on the Zand, the commentaries on the Avesta, rather than on the Avesta itself.²⁰ What is of interest to us here is that mystical elements of pure contemplation have been discerned in the teaching of some of the pre-Islamic Zandīks.²¹

Thus, the world of pre-Islamic Persia offered a variety of religions and beliefs, all of which contained elements of mystical experience. Into this world of social disorder, religious crisis and mystical aspiration, Islam forced its way, delivering the final blow to the civilizations of the ancient Near East and bearing fresh ideas and new aspirations to the world. When Persia was conquered by the Arabs, Zoroastrianism, the religion of the state, was defeated along with the state itself. However, it was not till two centuries later that most of Persia became converted to Islam.

The new religion preached by Muhammad urged man's absolute submission to God's will, the expression of which was believed to be contained in the Qur'an. This God was unique and close at hand:

"We have created man and we know what his soul whispers within him, for we are nearer to him than his jugular vein." (Qur'an, 50:15). Although, according to some non-Sufi interpreters, this verse refers to Allah's knowledge of man, rather than the latter's union with him, it has been often mystically interpreted as an allusion to man's union with God. The human soul through which God had granted life and intelligence to man was considered in the Qur'an as something mysterious, something noble and divine. From a psychological point of view, this soul was seen as the "commanding soul" (al-nafs al-'ammārah) (12:53), i.e., commanding the evil and physical desires, while from the ethical standpoint it was called the "blaming soul" (al-nafs al-lawwāmah) (75:2), corresponding to the conscience morale. But when viewed from the purely mystical standpoint, it was called the "tranquil soul" (al-nafs al-muṭma-'innah) (89:27), ready to join its Lord. This is the Qur'anic basis of the return to God in which Muslim mystics have sought justification for their teachings.

Islam laid great stress on the divine unity and on man's dependence on God. It urged penitence on the sceptical and Epicurean aristocracy of Mecca and threatened them with the coming of divine wrath and the tortures of hell. In such a system of theocentric cosmology, Allah was considered as the reality, al-ḥaqq--a word which was later used in Sufi terminology and which played an important role in the persecution of the martyred Ḥallāj. This word was originally used in the Qur'anic text to mean fixed reality, and it was later that pantheistic tendencies ascribed absolute reality to it. A rather pantheistic interpretation was made also of the following passage in the Qur'an: "Allah's are the East and the West; wherever ye turn, there is the face of Allah." (2:115). This, together with several other passages of the Qur'an, reveal the mystical character some critics of past generations have failed to recognize in Islam.²²

Absolute devotion to God, as preached by Muhammad, demanded that man should honor and serve solely God, and required selflessness in connection with man's relation to God.²³ This mystical selflessness has found an especial expression in the Muslim notion of the obligatory daily prayer or ṣalāt, one of the five pillars of faith in Islam. The humble attitude with which Muslim daily prayer is performed reveals the strange feeling that the believer may experience in finding himself in the presence of his Creator.²⁴ It may be considered as a real, though formal, experience of man's direct communication with the Deity. In fact, there is a divine tradition which divides the ṣalāt between man and God, as though

it were two parts of a dialogue.²⁵ That is why the ṣalāt has often been styled the ascension of the believer in God's presence.

Allah, of whom Muhammad was but a servant and messenger, was not just an omnipotent deity to be feared but also a compassionate one. Accordingly, Muhammad's message was not only a message of fear but a gospel of hope as well.²⁶ Nevertheless, the vision of the final destruction of the world, together with the coming judgment of Allah on mankind on the Day of Resurrection haunted the minds of the early Muslims of Mecca and did not leave them even during their warlike days in Medina.

The sharp contrast generally drawn between the Prophet's life in his Meccan and Medinan periods is not historically justified, even though the post-emigration situation contained problems that required much flexibility and diplomatic talent. This did not, however, turn him away from the passionate endeavor begun in Mecca to preach his religious ideals. Even the conception of the negation of the world was not erased from his mind by the spoils of war that came to him in Medina. The joys and blessings of paradise being the main goal of the ordinary Muslim, fear of hell and aspirations toward paradise remained the leading conceptions of the community with regard to Allah.

Monastic life, to which there is but one brief reference in the Qur'an (57:27), was by no means denigrated in early Islam. As a matter of fact, the oft-cited tradition of "no monasticism in Islam" does not occur in canonical collections and seems to have been introduced in later times.²⁷ Although Muhammad did not praise extreme monasticism, neither did he criticize it. That the epithet "monk" (rāhib) was given in early Islamic times to various pious individuals reveals that there was nothing odious about it at that time.²⁸ The fear of God, for which there is some justification in the revelation encouraged some of the Prophet's companions to practice strict ascetism.

It should be borne in mind that Muhammad's entire life was regarded by his disciples and companions as the unexcelled model of purity and piety, so that even Muslim warriors of later times who were fighting to carry this new message throughout the world endeavored to follow and imitate his pious deeds in their daily life. When the unexpected conquest of Syria, Egypt, and Persia--all yielding a vast amount of rich spoils of war--turned some spoil-hunters of Jāhiliyah-minded Arabs toward the search for worldly pleasures, pious followers of the Prophet did not hesitate to protest. A result of this protest was the so-called Great

Mutiny, which ended in the overthrow and assassination of the third caliph and led to the notorious conflict between Ali and Mu^Cāwiyah, and eventually gave rise to terrible civil wars, sectarianism, and the rise of the Persian sectors of Iraq and the Shi^Cites of Khurasan against the Umayyads. During all these episodes, faithful believers remained in protest, and the ever-increasing tendency toward non-conformism led by prominent ascetics was one manifestation of this protest. Moreover, Sufism appeared as a protest against a disturbed society, its traditionalism and its intellectualism.

II

The death of Muhammad in 632 A.D. left his community face to face with problems of various kinds, the first and most fundamental being the question of the succession and the nature of the social and religious leadership of the Muslim world. Although the emergence of a number of more crucial events caused this problem to be neglected for a while, the question of succession later resulted in divisions within the Islamic world that led to a series of civil wars. One faction, the Shi^Cites, who were partisans of Ali, the son-in-law of Muhammad, took serious issue with the orthodox position that considered the legitimacy of the elections of the first three caliphs as unquestionable. There were also the Kharijites who opposed both Ali and his Syrian rival.

The civil wars, in which these politico-religious opposition parties were all involved, created new difficulties with each of these parties claiming to be the only true Muslims and considering others unbelievers. Moreover, all viewed the ruling Umayyad caliphs, if not as godless, at least as usurpers and unqualified rulers. That these rulers did not hesitate to violate certain Islamic rules was beyond question; the question was whether the committing of such mortal sins excluded them from the Islamic community.

The Kharijites maintained that a Muslim who committed a mortal sin must be excluded from Islam, and that even an Imam, if guilty of a mortal sin, ceased to be a Muslim and must be ousted. The opposite view was held by the Murji'ites who contended that mortal sin did not exclude a Muslim from his faith, and that an imam, even if guilty of mortal sin, did not cease to be a Muslim. As a matter of fact, the Murji'ites found their name ("postponers")

in their argument that judgment on the Umayyads and on all sinners professing the Islamic faith should be postponed to the life hereafter and to God. Thus the Murji'ites declined to pass judgment on who was entitled to salvation as a good Muslim and thereby, in effect, gave support to the Umayyads, whom they probably recognized as no more than the de facto rulers of the Muslim community.

This compromising school of Murji'ites even maintained that, in the well-known Ali-Mu^cāwiyah conflict, both sides were right, and that there was no inconsistency in imagining that two caliphs might rule at the same time in different parts of the Muslim world.²⁹ On the question of caliphs and sinners, the Shi^cites shared the view of the Murji'ites that the commission of mortal sins did not exclude a Muslim from his community; but this view did not prevent them from judging and condemning the Umayyads as godless rulers with heathen tendencies.

Thus no possible connection can be made between the Murji'ites and the Shi^cites, even though they shared more than one point in their creeds; and the position of Laoust, for example, that the Murji'ites may have had connections with Muhammad al-Ḥanafīyah, a son of Ali cannot be historically justified.³⁰ The son of Ali was the patron of one of the most ancient schools of Shi^cism, which inevitably played a considerable part in the fall of the Umayyads.

The Shi^cites held--and this was the primary distinction between them and other Islamic sects--that the office of imam was by no means something that God would leave to men's choice, but that divine decree would determine who would become Muhammad's successor as the legal imam. This divinely appointed imam could not be Abū Bakr, whom men had recognized as the first caliph at the death of Muhammad but, rather, the more qualified Ali, the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, who later was elected the fourth caliph. The Shi^cites also believed in the infallibility of imams in their pronouncements on faith and morals. Thus, the Shi^cite imam was believed to be guided by God in all his acts.

Among other theological problems wrestled with in Murji'ite-Kharijite circles, the most controversial was the question of free will versus predestination. In this connection, opposite positions were taken, in particular by the Jabarite and Qadarite schools. The Qadarites believed in man's free will, and for this reason, despite the Christian elements in the views of some of their fore-runners, they were looked on by orthodox Muslims as being tied to Zoroastrian beliefs. That they considered man as creator of his own actions was

interpreted as a new expression of Zoroastrian dualism. The opposite view, held by the Jabarite school, denied man's freedom of will and made nearly no distinction in this connection between man and inanimate nature, viewing man's acts as subordinate to the compulsion of God.

Passages relating to both free will and predestination are to be found in the Qur'an but by no means does their content permit one to agree with Hubert Grimme and Golziher that the passages dealing with free will and responsibility may belong to the irresponsible period of Muhammad's life in Mecca, whereas during the period in Medina, his revelations contained only the concept of predestination.³¹ The point is that the position of the Qur'an concerning this problem was more ethical than theological in nature.

As a matter of fact, the theological aspect of the problem was raised outside the Mecca and Medina experiences of the Muslims, perhaps primarily in Iraq and Khurasan, where the problem had been pondered long before the advent of Islam. The new discussion probably represented a revival of the ancient problem of Zurvanite Zoroastrian scholasticism. The fact that, in accordance with a pseudo-prophetic tradition, the Qadarites have been called the Magians of the Muslim community may suggest their connection with pre-Islamic Persia. There is no wonder then that an early ascetic with Sufi inclinations, al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī, refused to accept his inheritance from his father, who professed Qadarite ideas. As Islam forbade members of different religions to inherit from one another, this saintly youth elected to live his life in poverty rather than accept his inheritance from a Qadarite father.

The first Muslim to hold the position of the Jabarites is said to have been Jahm b. Ṣafwān, a Persian proselyte of late Umayyad times who rose in rebellion against Arab rule and was killed circa 764 A.D. in Khurasan.³² The doctrine of free will was first taught by a certain Ma'bad al-Juḥanī, who was probably a disciple of the well-known Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. Moreover, the claim that Ḥasan--a supposed forerunner of Sufism--may himself have held this stand is probably justifiable, but he was not a fervent preacher of this doctrine.³³

The Qadarites formed a kind of politico-religious party that is supposed even to have played a part--though limited--in some of the dynastic affairs of the Umayyads.³⁴ During the period of religious and social chaos when Umayyad rule was being replaced by the Abbasid caliphate, Muslim society witnessed the growth of a kind of

theosophical school which later developed into the real mystical dimension of Islam--Sufism. This theosophical movement represented in its early days a reaction against theological speculations as well as against strict traditionalism. As a matter of fact, traditionalism and rationalism had been in opposition and now both were in decline. Concerning articles of belief, ordinances of worship and other religious matters, the prophetic tradition was regarded with only slightly less reverence than the Qur'an, and was always considered the most reliable authority after it. But the Mu^tazilites, who rejected anthropomorphic tendencies in Islamic revelation and tradition, stressed that everything in tradition and revelation must be interpreted in accord with reason. This, indeed, had considerable effect in shattering some of the firm emphasis orthodox Muslims laid on tradition.

Nevertheless, when the Ash^carites began their campaign against Mu^tazilism, doubts were cast on the value and limits of reason. The doctors of the Ash^carite school went so far as to consider the law of causality as non-applicable to the process of creation, so that even for what the rationalists used to call the Law of Nature, they substituted the notion of the so-called Divine Habit. It was not a law, they maintained, but simply the habit laid on nature by God, that makes certain things follow others. Thus, the predominance of Ash^carism was to some extent a factor in the decline of reason in religious domains.

With neither tradition nor reason to inspire great confidence, there remained, in the search for religious certitude, only the so-called inner light, of which the Sufis were fervent advocates. These were pious people who were unable to satisfy their religious needs within the traditional and intellectual Muslim orthodoxies. To them, traditional services and rituals only competed with the search for paradise as reward; the exoteric sciences of the jurists and theologians were nothing but the normal path to prestige and wealth--the mere art of building the worldly stable as Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī would say.³⁵ Traces of these early Islamic sects, however, can be found in the Sufi heritage. The well-known religious liberalism of the Sufis reminds us, for instance, of the Murji'ite willingness to postpone judgment. The idea of trust in God, on which early Sufis laid so much stress, seems also to bear the Jabarite imprint. Similarly, the incarnation theories preached by some early Sufis were probably borrowed from the extremist Shi^cites. Nevertheless, their firm belief that the ways leading to God are as numerous as human souls did not allow them to follow those sects

and individuals who claimed that the slightest deviation from traditional Islam led to heresy. Indeed they found truth, in greater or lesser measure, in all creeds and faiths.

Among the earliest individuals on whom the name Sufi was bestowed, there was Jābir b. Ḥayyān, known as Geber rex Arabum to the Medieval West, who reportedly was a contemporary of the early Abbasid caliphs. This grandfather of modern chemistry was an outstanding exponent of hermetic knowledge in Islam. As a matter of fact, the hermetic nature of writings bearing the name of Jābir caused him to be regarded as a mysterious personality. There is not, however, sufficient evidence to cast serious doubt on his historicity. True, much of this hermetic legacy in the ancient Near East, which existed centuries before Jābir was born, was concerned with alchemy, astrology, and other occult sciences, but there was also a philosophical, mystical aspect with which another Sufi of a somewhat later time, the Egyptian Dhū al-Nūn, was connected. Indeed, Jābir (d. 776) reportedly had close connections with the same Shi^cite circles that the well-known Sufi martyr al-Ḥallāj was linked to in his early days. Al-Ḥallāj is also said to have been an alchemist for a while, but his Sufi vocation predominated.

Whereas Jābir was more inclined to alchemy, his Egyptian colleague, Dhū al-Nūn, was inclined to mystical experience. A Muslim Negro, Dhū al-Nūn (d. 850) preached asceticism and was a father of mystical theory. He is credited with the knowledge of the secrets of hieroglyphic inscriptions as well as with the authorship of some books on occult sciences.³⁶ He is said also to have belonged to the same school of occultism to which Jābir had belonged.³⁷ It was this hermetic feature of his teaching, rather than his supposed Mu^ctazilite tendencies, that may have caused his arrest in Cairo and his imprisonment in Baghdad. The mystical teaching of Dhū al-Nūn was based on gnosis or intuitive knowledge, which was esteemed by the Sufis as the best path to the knowledge of God, neither reason nor tradition being comparable to it.

The spiritual purification that Sufis expected to attain through self-mortification and the renunciation of worldly pleasures was believed to end in the enlightenment of their hearts, which they termed safā ("purity of heart") and from which they sometimes claimed the word "Sufi" was derived.

However, whereas the name of a similar group with mystical and hermetic features known as the "Brethren of Purity" (Ikhwān al-Ṣafā) can actually be said to derive from this mystical concept

of purity, the same etymology cannot be applied to the name Sufi. Among the etymologies proposed for this word, the most probable is no doubt its derivation from the word suf, "wool." Sufis wore coarse woolen garments as a sign of their religious mendicancy. These woolen robes, usually made of rags, were as much the mark of a Sufi as bushy hair and bare feet are the signs of an American hippy. It should be added that a few mystics refused to wear any distinctive mark, and there were persons who maintained with Hujwīrī that, "It is inward glow [hurqa] that makes the Sūfī, not the religious habit [khirqah]."38

Despite their strict rejection of worldly pleasures, Sufis did not regard the formal devotion of orthodox Muslims as of great importance. Moreover, for the formal knowledge of learned theologians they had nothing but contempt. When Maḥrūf, an early Sufi of Baghdad (d. 815), tried to argue that Sufism consisted of grasping the realities and of renouncing what was in the hands of created beings, he seems to have found even the devotions of the orthodox and the theologians to be worldly and among the unreal things to be renounced.

When asked by a young prince what the way to God was, Dhū al-Nūn replied that there was a lesser way and a greater way. Any one who desired the lesser one should abandon the world and give up sinning. But he who chose the greater one must abandon everything but God and empty his heart of all things.³⁹ Thus, a formal traditional devotion was far from being the greater way to God.

The Sufi insistence that God should not be worshipped out of hope or fear but solely for God's sake was the point that differentiated the ordinary ascetic (zāhid), for whom hell and paradise constituted the main concern, from the mystic (Ḥarīf) whose sole concern was divine love. This concept of divine love, based on disinterested devotion to God, received greatest stress in the teachings of Rabīḥah of Baṣrah. This saintly woman (d. 801) was a prototype of the mystic, an Islamic Santa Teresa, who is believed to have spent her life in seclusion and celibacy. Her extreme asceticism and her mystical teachings brought her several devoted disciples and associates among whom were such pious men as al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Sufyān al-Thawrī.

One of the earliest devotees of Sufism, somewhat earlier than Rabīḥah, was Ibrāhīm b. Adham (d. ca. 777), the princely saint of Balkh whose legend reminds us of the story of Buddha. According to his well-known legend, he was the son of an independent prince

of Balkh of Arab stock. Influenced by some kind of divine voice, or impressed by the exhortation of some divine messenger, he gave up his throne, chose the life of poverty and became a wandering dervish living on his own labor.

A more celebrated Sufi of Persia was Bāyazīd of Bisṭām (d. 875), who is considered to have held the same high rank among the Sufis as Gabriel had among the angels.⁴⁰ Ecstatic paradoxes connected with his name reveal great boldness of conception that sometimes manifested pantheistic features. One day, in a state of mystical trance, he cried out: "Glory to me! How great is my majesty." In a similar case he uttered with strange boldness: "Beneath my cloak there is nothing but God." Pantheism or incarnation, these utterances underwent elaborate interpretations that made them acceptable to orthodox Muslims.

Nevertheless, when a few decades later almost the same utterance was made by the younger Ḥallāj (d. 922), it did not receive such a favorable response. Like Bāyazīd of Bisṭām, Ḥallāj probably also had a Zoroastrian grandfather. Up till the age of forty, he had lived with Sufi companions. Then he travelled in Khurasan, Turkistan, India, and finally settled in Baghdad, where he got in touch with Muṭtazilites, Shiʿites, and several other religious and social sects. Arrested for unknown involvements, he spent eight years in prison, and then after a seven-month trial, he was mutilated, crucified, decapitated, and burned to ashes. His crime, according to later Sufis who recognized him as their martyr par excellence, was that he had divulged the divine secret. He had uttered, during an ecstatic trance, but before those who could not understand it: "I am the Truth."

While the disciples of Ḥallāj later gathered around Abū ʿUmar al-Ḥashimī in Ahwāz and around Fāris al-Dīnawarī in Khurasan to continue his teachings, the Sufi school of Baghdad, formerly headed by the well-known al-Junayd, did not show great sympathy for this eccentric martyr. Thus, while the disciples of Ḥallāj succeeded later in finding an echo of his teachings in the voice of Abū Saʿīd in Khurasan, the Sufi school of al-Junayd (also called the Master of the Way) leaned increasingly toward intellectualism and traditionalism. This mystical school of Baghdad, however, did for Sufism what the Shafīʿī school did for traditionalism in establishing its fundamental principles. The main topics of this school were gnosis, love, and the unity of God (tawḥīd) so that its teachings on these topics were worked out and developed in a speculative mysticism.

Al-Junayd, the inspired teacher of this school, held that Sufi truths contained esoteric elements that should not be revealed to the uninitiated. In his correspondence he insisted ceaselessly to his friends that they talk to people carefully and with caution. His school contained such distinguished Sufis as Shiblī and Nūrī, and even al-Ḥallāj in his early career had connections with it. The caution with which the Master of the Way used to teach spared him from what happened later to Ḥallāj and his friend Ibn 'Aṭā', whereas what he actually taught could also seem to the uninitiated people as a pure incarnation of pantheism. According to his teachings, Sufism consisted essentially of being with God with no attachment to anything else. So, when the Sufi was wholly present in God, he was wholly lost to himself, and this was what the Sufis called annihilation. Al-Junayd (d. 910) did not live to witness the tragic episode of al-Ḥallāj, but al-Ḥallāj had in fact left the school while the master was still alive, the latter being too conservative for the tastes of this eccentric mystic.

With the decline of the Sufi school of Baghdad, following the execution of al-Ḥallāj, Khurasan offered a more hospitable climate for the movement. In fact, this eastern province of Persia had never ceased to contribute to the development of Sufism, with great personalities like Ibrāhīm Adham (d. 777), Shaqīq-i Balkhī (d. 810), Aḥmad b. Ḥarb (d. 849), Aḥmad b. Khadrūyah (d. 864), Abū Ḥafṣ-i Ḥaddād (d. 879), and many others.

At the time that Persian literature was attaining its climax in Khurasan, Sufism was also producing great leaders there. One of these was Ḥakīm of Tirmidh, to whom the Sufi sect bearing his name (Ḥakīmīyah) paid homage, and who is said to have devoted the larger part of his life to ascetic practices and Sufi meditation in his native town, located in the Upper Oxus not far from Balkh. He was author of many interesting books, including his autobiography. His ideas on sainthood were greatly esteemed by later Sufis, and his psychological writings may have influenced al-Ghazzālī (d. 1111). Finally, his ideas on sainthood are supposed to have had some influence on Ibn al-'Arabī's ideas on the subject.

While this great Sufi of Khurasan was a traditionalist, a jurist, and a theologian, the famous Abū al-Ḥasan-i Khariqānī, who lived a century later, was nearly an illiterate who had spent his early days as a donkey-driver. Nevertheless, his imposing dignity was such that even learned people who came into his presence could scarcely utter a word before him.⁴¹ Though but a simple peasant from the Bisṭām district, he was viewed by his fellow Sufis to be continuing Bāyazīd's experiences. His sayings, a collection of

which is extant, reveal an experience vécue of mystical acquisitions.⁴² He inspired such reverence in the famous Shaykh Abū Sa^cīd that, when the latter came into his presence, he did not utter a word. Abū al-Ḥasan asked him why he kept silent. Abū Sa^cīd answered that "one interpreter is enough for one theme." Thus, so long as Abū al-Ḥasan was talking, Abū Sa^cīd was silent.⁴³

Abū Sa^cīd b. Abū al-Khayr (d. 1048) was regarded as the greatest Sufi leader of his time, and had a wonderful religious experience with the extraordinary power of thought-reading. Moreover, he was the first Sufi shaykh to recite poetry in the course of his sermons instead of the Qur'an and traditions. A large part of these poems were compositions of earlier Sufis, and his own compositions were very few in number. Nevertheless, it was chiefly through this great shaykh of Khurasan that Persian poetry became more closely linked with Sufism. He is also said to have corresponded with the philosopher Avicenna, and according to a biographer, he even had a personal meeting with the sage in the latter's own monastery at Nishapur. According to a popular story, after they had conversed with each other for three days, the philosopher said of him to his disciples: "All that I know, he sees," while the mystic declared to his followers: "All that I see, he knows."

This encounter, differently recorded in various sources and probably lacking an historical basis, illustrates the idea that Sufis had about the character of their own teachings. Attempts to bring this anti-intellectual and anti-traditional mysticism within the scope of the newly established scholasticism of orthodox Islam were undertaken by a Sufi scholar of the same century, the famous Imam Qushayrī (d. 1074) who is claimed to have disapproved of Abū Sa^cīd's supposed extravagance.⁴⁴

In contrast with Abū Sa^cīd, who did not like to waste his time in the tedious task of writing, Imam Qushayrī was a prolific writer and his works, together with a few remnants of the treatises, of some precursors, contributed to crystallizing Sufi teachings into scholastic speculations. Imam Qushayrī's tract on Sufism, al-Risālat al-Qushayriyah, was a real handbook of Sufi knowledge, making the Sufi doctrines available to theologians and scholars.

His younger contemporary, Khwājah ^cAbd Allāh Anṣārī of Herat (d. 1089), held a similar attitude toward Sufism. He was a Hanbalite scholar, whose encounter with Abū al-Ḥasan-i Khariqānī had inclined him to Sufism. He wrote books on Sufism, among which his collection of mystical litanies, the Munājāt, is still much enjoyed

in Persia. Nevertheless, in practice he remained a Hanbalite scholar rather than a Sufi, and it was as a theologian that he was persecuted and exiled in his last years.

Intellectualist tendencies of the late eleventh century in Islam led Sufism to speculation and systematization. This in turn gave rise to Sufi orders, now scattered throughout the Muslim world. These orders, however, came into being just when living Sufism was on the road to decline, thus marking a new stage in the development of this movement.⁴⁵

III

Whereas the execution of al-Hallāj taught the Sufis to avoid what can be called unorthodox attitudes, the conversion of the theologian al-Ghazzālī to Sufism caused the orthodox Muslims to regard Sufism with more respect and greater interest. Al-Ghazzālī is said to have spent his last years in a Sufi monastery which he built close to his former college, abandoning scholastic speculation for mystical intuition. It was almost half a century after his death that the first orders of Sufis came into being. His conversion to the mystical way no doubt had a decisive effect on reconciling Sunnism to Sufism--an achievement without which the Sufi orders would not have had the opportunity for missionary activities.

The founding of Sufi monasteries had begun much earlier. Institutions financed by pious endowments were originally built in the remote frontiers of the Islamic world. But when Niẓām al-Mulk (d. 1092), founder of the first great universities in the Saljūq kingdom, also built a series of Sufi monasteries in the bosom of Near Eastern capitals, other grandees, even princes and caliphs, followed his example and, within a few decades, Sufi monasteries were to be seen in nearly the whole of the Muslim Near East. These monasteries had a peculiar attraction for those Sufis who did not like to give up urban life and preferred to have a connection with scholastic activities of theologians and jurists.

When the Sunni-Sufi conflict was nearly over, there flourished in Iraq and Khurasan a number of Sufi teachers to whom followers flocked. Such Sufi leaders as ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Ġilānī (d. 1166), ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī (d. 1234), and Najm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 1221) had their own monasteries with considerable numbers of

disciples and adepts, but even though the great Shaykh Suhrawardī had received a caliphal diploma which recognized him as the Great Master of all the Sufis, the system of the orders was not yet fully established in this period.

Moreover, long before the orders came into existence, a series of Sufi sects had been recorded in the works of Hujwīrī, Qushayrī, Sarraj, and other authors. These sects were essentially the result of doctrinal schism. In other words, such mystical groups as the Nūrīs, Hulūlīs, ^cIshqīs, and Wāṣilīs are to Sufism what Murji'ites, Jabarites, Mu^ctazilites and Qadarites are to orthodox Islam, denoting differences in tenets and principles rather than divergences in worship and rituals.

It was only in the last days of Saljūq rule that the first Sufi orders emerged in the Muslim Near East, though still a bit more time was needed before they found their final shape. Nevertheless these orders later formed a network of Sufi organization that gradually spread from one end of the Muslim world to the other, with their own hierarchies, customs and rituals.

Their system, however, was considerably influenced by both orthodox traditionalism and formal scholasticism in the course of its development. Religious rituals were usually observed with almost the same carefulness as in the mosques, and Sufi teachers--just like the traditional transmitters in orthodox schools--were not considered reliable unless they had received formal authority from their masters--Khirqah and Wilāyah in the case of Sufis. The founding of the orders was in one sense a definite triumph of Sufism in the obstinate struggle it had undertaken long before for recognition,⁴⁶ but the systematization of Sufism within the conventional frame of orders also put an end to its spontaneity and its ecstatic character.

That some Sufi thinkers like ^cAyn al-Qudāt-i Hamadānī (d. 1163), Ibn al-^cArabī (d. 1240), and Ibn Sab^cīn (d. 1270) could from time to time reveal their intuitive speculations had little to do with the usual life of the orders, and their influence did not extend beyond the literary works of Sufis, which was still open to ecstasy and intuition.

The formation of Sufi orders, moreover, provoked schisms and differences against which Sufism had originally emerged as a reaction. The critical remarks of the liberal Sufi, Sa^cdī of Shiraz (d. 1292), probably refer to this change. He claimed that in the

early days of Islam, the Sufis were outwardly scattered but inwardly united, whereas they later became apparently organized yet really dispersed.⁴⁷ This was perhaps the reason for which Sa'cdī--himself a disciple of Suhrawardī and also naturally disposed to Sufism--did not openly join any of the numerous Sufi orders of his time.

At the time that Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1406) was writing the Muqaddimah,⁴⁸ Sufism, no doubt under the influence of the order system, had become not so much a set of doctrines as a mode of life--a método de vida as M. Asin Palacios calls it.⁴⁹ This cannot explain however the whole development of Sufism--particularly in the period before Ibn Khaldūn.

Although the Sufi life on the whole was a contemplative one, it nevertheless differed from order to order, from teacher to teacher. A Sufi order was an organized brotherhood, formed around a Sufi teacher who was believed to have the gift of miraculous powers and therefore to be qualified to lead others in the divine path, from which fact is derived the commonest designation of a Sufi order, ṭarīqah, which means "pathway."

These ṭarīqahs, differently explained by different Sufi teachers, separate various Sufi orders from each other. It is no wonder, then, that in the course of time a large variety of Sufi orders developed in various countries ranging in their mode of life from ascetic pacifism to militant pantheism. The orders differ in customs and in rites, whose observance is required of every initiate.

The initiate receives his formal admission into the order through a series of ceremonies supervised by his Sufi teacher, usually of a symbolic character. This symbolism gives a mysterious aspect to the life of Sufi monasteries, and differs according to orders and rituals. In one order, for example, the initiate receives an earring from the shaykh, reminding him probably of the total submission the shaykh urges on him. In another case, he is bound--on shoulder or waist--by a black cloth or belt, which will remind him always of his continual contest with the devil. Hanging a small stone on his neck symbolizes the initiate's total submission--whence the Turkish taslīm-tāsh, i.e., the contentment stone--both used by the Turkish order called Bektashī.

The Sufi dance so greatly appreciated by the Turkish Mevlevis displays also a symbolic character. This symbolic feature

is also to be found in the attire of Sufis. Sufi orders differ even in this respect. While some wear caps in the shape of a rose, tulip or heart, others may wear turbans--just like orthodox priests. There are Sufis wearing caps with five, twelve, or eighteen sections, whereas others walk through the streets with long hair floating in the air. The shape of their caps, the color of their garments display a variety of different tastes--all, however, bearing their peculiar symbols.

The spiritual teachers of several orders wore the turbans of orthodox jurists, symbolizing their claim to supreme knowledge, the gnosis. This supreme knowledge is what the Sufis claimed to be the esoteric teaching of the Prophet inherited by them through their shaykhs. It was however only the intuitive acquisition of early Sufis that was systematized and formulated in a form acceptable to orthodox formalism.

That all the Sufi orders trace their spiritual patronship, through either Abū Bakr or Ali, to the person of Muhammad indicates not only their attempt to establish their ritual traditions on the same authority as that used by orthodox traditionalists but also reveals their claim to inheritance of the supposed esoteric teachings of the Prophet.

The Sufis claimed that Muhammad's teaching was twofold: the exoteric one was addressed to all Muslims whereas the esoteric was disclosed only to some intimate companions. The Sufis pretended to have inherited the latter from these intimate companions to whom they believed their shaykhs were connected. The possession of this esoteric knowledge so elevated the Sufi teachers in the eyes of their followers that not infrequently cults formed around them, and their tombs became, in many cases, places of pilgrimage.

Moreover, the transmission of such sacred knowledge was usually accompanied by great discretion on the part of the shaykh. (A similar situation was to be met by the traditionalists in another way.) This feature added a mysterious appearance to some Sufi orders--which might suggest why rulers were suspicious of them.

Whereas most Sufi orders avoided political involvements, some had a certain interest in what can be called political affairs. It is conceivable that the pretention to the prophetic wisdom--supposedly inherited from Muhammad--may have led some of the Sufi shaykhs to assume a political mission. That they sometimes used to call their felt hat the crown of poverty and to add the titles

Shah or Sultan to their humble names could have sufficed to make them suspect in the eyes of some narrow-minded sovereigns. The popularity of Sufis and their success in Muslim society by causing a loss, and not a small one, in the prestige of jurists and in the high position they held in Muslim eyes, excited the latter's anger against the Sufis.⁵⁰

Nevertheless, there were Sufi shaykhs with definite political or social pretensions. The Kharijite-Shi^cite disposition to launch open warfare against unqualified rulers never ceased to haunt pious Muslims, so that an ambitious shaykh could well represent a revolt against an unqualified sovereign as a religious or social necessity. This is the reason that Sufi orders occasionally have been involved in fighting against invaders, oppressors, and even unjust rulers.

The history of Persia, like that of several other Islamic countries offers several cases of the involvement of Sufi orders in such activities. One interesting example, which goes back to pre-Mongol times, is the case of the Kāzarūnīd order, founded by Abū Ishāq-i Kāzarūnī (d. 1033), a well-known saint of Persia.⁵¹ He was an ardent preacher and his order lasted for centuries. Although he came of a family of Zoroastrians, he made great efforts to convert Zoroastrians of Fārs to Islam. The order bearing his name spread through Persia to India, China, and Anatolia. Owing to its militant character, it played a very considerable role in the Ottoman Empire during the fifteenth century. Another example of militant Sufism was the case of the Jūrīyah order. The founder, a certain Shaykh Ḥasan-i Jūrī (d. 1338), succeeded in preparing the way for what some historians call the "Shi^ci republic" of Sarbid-ārids.⁵² But the best example in the history of Persia is the case of the Safavids, a dynasty of Persian rulers, named after the title of its founder's grandfather, the well-known Shaykh Safī al-Dīn of Ardabīl (d. 1335). Although Shaykh Safi himself, like so many other shaykhs of his time, was an orthodox Sunni, his successors and sons embraced Shi^cism and later made it the state religion of Persia.⁵³ The Mongol invasion (ca. 1219) witnessed the militant response of the Kubrāwīyah in Transoxania. During this struggle the founder of this order Shaykh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 1221) met his death. We are told by some historians that having obstinately refused the Mongol offer of a compromise, this saint preferred the gallant death of a militant martyr to a servile life of submission to infidels. After his death, his order counted a galaxy of saints, among whom 'Alā' al-Dawla-i Simnānī (d. 1336) founded the branch called Ruknīyah; Sayyid Muhammad Nurbakhsh started a branch called

the Nurbakhshī order, and a certain Sayyid ʿAbdallāh established a new order called Dhahabīs.

An ex-commissioner of the Mongol state, afterwards converted to Sufism, ʿAlā' al-Dawlah stood fast against the pantheistic doctrine of Ibn al-ʿArabī, a doctrine which was appreciated greatly by Shaykh ʿAbd al-Razzāq of the Suhrawardī school, which had a special attraction for Sufis in Persia. He had, however, enough tolerance to seek spiritual guidance even from Mongol monks of his time. He succeeded, as did his other Kubrāwī predecessors--Saʿd al-Dīn Hamūyah (d. ca. 1252) and Sayyid Ali Hamadānī (d. 1385)--in establishing closer connections between Shiʿism and Sunnism in their Sufi teachings.

His other Kubrāwī colleague, Sayyid Muhammad Nurbakhsh, (d. 1463) openly embraced Shiʿism. This Sufi teacher had, however, other aspirations of a more ambitious nature. Several times he was proclaimed caliph by his followers, and several times arrested, banished, or imprisoned by the sultan contemporary with him, the Timurid Shah Rukh. His order, despite various persecutions, found its way to India where for a long time it held a considerable position in Kashmir.

The last offshoot of the Kubrāwīyah was the so-called Golden Order, the Dhahabīs. It openly professed Shiʿism and preserved--even during the unfavorable Safavid period--its supremacy in south Persia. Among its teachers the most celebrated was one Sayyid Qutb Nayrīzī (d. ca. 1759) who wrote Persian and Arabic poetry. His Sufi teaching reminds us of that of Ibn al-ʿArabī, whereas his Arabic poetry betrays the influence of the Egyptian Ibn al-Farīd and his Persian verses reveal something of the style of ʿAṭṭār. Some of his theosophical views have been criticized by the later Niʿmat Allāhī.

Among the Sufi orders that gained a certain popularity in Persia in the wake of the Mongol invasion, one should also name the Suhrawardīs and the Qalandarīs. The former, whose founder Shaykh ʿUmar al-Sahrawardī (d. 1234) was a friend and favorite of the Abbasid Caliph al-Nāṣir, lost its influence in Persia probably with the fall of Baghdad. As a matter of fact, the friendship between the caliph al-Nāṣir and the Sufi Suhrawardī was such that the caliph appointed him the chief of all Sufi monasteries, and sent him as his ambassador to the court of Muslim sovereigns. That Suhrawardī cites the name of this caliph as an authority in support of tradition is a curious point. Although the original order found

more disciples in Afghanistan and India, its offshoots remained active in Persia long after the episode of Baghdad. Among these sub-branches are the Khalwatī order of Khurasan and the Jamālīs of the district of Isfahan. The Ṣafawīyah order also was an offshoot of Suhrawardīyah but later it gradually developed into an independent order.

The Qalandarīs, and the Naqshbandīs as well, enjoyed only a limited success in Persia. The former was not really an organized order and the latter, being of a rigid Sunni character, could not establish a firm foothold in the pro-Shi'ite land of the Great Sophy.

The Qalandariyah, mentioned in the Arabian Nights, were a sort of wandering dervish sect rather than an order. They had no fixed rule or ritual and used to show--somewhat like the earlier Malāmatīs--an utter disregard for religious and social conventions. They probably originated in central Asia and were influenced by Indian ideas. It is said that a Persian, Jamāl al-Dīn Sāwajī, preached the beliefs of this discipline in fourteenth century Persia, which would explain why the members of this sect were so numerous in the early days of the Safavids.⁵⁴ That they had no enthusiasm for orthodox Sunnism is probably another reason. Some sources, however, trace them back to the Naqshbandīs--though probably with no reliable evidence.⁵⁵ The Naqshbandīs enjoyed great popularity in Transoxania and Afghanistan, just before the rise of the Safavid dynasty. The founder of the order was a Bahā' al-Dīn Muhammad (d. 1389) called Shāh-i Naqshband. He had spent several years in the service of a Tatar prince, but, once converted to Sufism, he led an ascetic life. His order was closely connected with an older one--that of Nāṣir al-Dīn b. Maḥmūd Shāshī called Khwājah-i Ahrār (d. 1490), who was the patron and spiritual teacher of Jāmī.⁵⁶ After the death of the Shāh-i Naqshband, however, the disputes of his descendants on succession, together with the advent of the Shi'ite Safavids, put an end to their influence in Persia. The Safavid order was but the Āzari branch of Suhrawardīs, whose founder, the famous Shaykh Ṣafī, was a well-known Sufi teacher of his time. Nevertheless, some legends may have been introduced later to make him a suitable ancestor for a royal dynasty of the Shi'ite faith--a sayyid.

Whereas the Ṣafawīyah order gave rise in Persia to the royal Safavid dynasty, in Asia Minor it developed into minor sub-divisions among which the Jalwatīs or Hudāīs recruited a considerable number of followers in the Ottoman Empire. The founder of the latter was a certain Pīr-i Uftādah (d. 1628) whose followers used to wear long hair.⁵⁷

Once ascended to the throne, the Persian Ṣafawīyah felt insecure amidst the bigoted and undisciplined Sufi militia, whose lack of interest in religious matters could be harmful to an inexperienced government whose support was based mainly on its state religion. These considerations, together with the hostile attitude of the Shi'ite ulama toward Sufism, led the Safavid kings to look on Sufis as a threat to the religion and to the state as well. Thus, Sufism was vanquished in the "Land of the Great Sophy," and outside the ancestral order and its titular custodianship of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn's tomb, there remained nothing of Sufism in the Safavid realm.

Their fall (1738) provided the Ni'mat-Allāhī order of India an opportunity to launch anew a Sufi movement in Persia. This Sufi order is still one of the most extensive, if not the largest, existing in Persia today. Its founder, Shah Ni'mat-Allāh Valī (d. 1431), is said to have enjoyed the favors of the Timurid, Shāh Rukh, but during the Safavid rule his descendants and successors remained in the Deccan, far from Persia. Shah Ni'mat-Allāh, author of more than three hundred Arabic and Persian treatises on mystical subjects, is famous in Persian literature for his apocalyptic sayings concerning the troubles of the last days of the world, with some messianic prophecies. He was born in Aleppo, spent several years in Mecca and Egypt, journeyed in Khurasan and Transoxania, and finally settled down in Kirman, where his tomb is still visited by groups of pilgrims. His poetical work, even though well appreciated by some Sufi readers, lacks great literary value; it is a rather monotonous and mediocre poetry with strong pantheistic ideas.

During the Safavid reign his descendants either migrated to India or remained in Persia under clever camouflage. They succeeded for a while, nevertheless, in finding a welcome response to their call in the chaotic situation of post-Safavid Persia. We are told that some thirty thousand followers gathered around the Indian Mīr Ma'sūm Ali Shah, a Ni'mat-Allāhī teacher who arrived in Shiraz in the happy days of Karīm Khān Vakil (d. 1779). But, at the instigation of hostile ulama, the rulers of the Zand dynasty persecuted them and obliged them to go to Mesopotamia. Toward the beginning of the Qajar period, the Ni'mat-Allāhīs made an attempt to establish their master's cult in Kirman where his shrine was erected but this was met by the opposition of the ulama and resulted in chaos during which a fervent Sufi, Mushtāq Ali was killed (1792). Also, the saintly poet, Nūr Ali Shah (d. 1789), who had recruited a considerable number of followers in Isfahan and Kurdistan, was accused in the meantime of dynastic ambitions and is said to have met his death in wandering exile, reportedly poisoned.⁵⁸

It was not until the middle of the Qajar period that the Ni^ḥmat-Allāhīs finally could establish their order in Persia. The keen interest the prime minister Hājī Mīrzā Āqāsī (d. 1849) had in their cause may have been a reason for their success. Later shaykhs, however, particularly Sultan Ali Shah (d. 1909) in Khurasan, and Ṣafī Ali Shah (d. 1898) in Tehran, gained a part of their popularity through their traditionalism, as both wrote commentaries on the Qur'an.

Generally speaking, if the order system of Sufism has not met in Persia the fervent welcome it has received in India, Turkey, Egypt and North Africa, one reason, no doubt, lies in the hostility of the Persians to organized religious groupings; this factor, however, must not be exaggerated. Nevertheless, the anti-hierarchical Sufism of the period before and during Ḥallāj's time has always been kept alive throughout Persian literature and its reflection is to be found in Persian lyrics up to the present. So, even if the Sufi orders did not make considerable contributions to the development of Sufism in Persia proper, Persian literature has remained the mirror for Sufi thought for even a longer time.

IV

Muslim mystical experience has found its best expression, with perhaps a few exceptions, in Persian poetry. Was that because mystical visions seemed more congenial to Persians than mystical rites?

This literature was addressed much more to the reader's heart than to his mind and therefore intuitive elements were prevalent in it. Although it is true that its entire content may not be considered intuitive, even in its ethical and didactical aspects, it does not strictly follow the conventions of secular literature.

For traditional conventions, the Sufi poet has no great respect, viewing them essentially as veils separating his mind from the object of continual vision. "Don't think of aught except the vision of me" was the bitter rebuke Rūmī thought he received from his divine lover, who did not like him to be preoccupied with rhyme and prosody.⁵⁹ Thus, rhyme and all other conventions of prosody were regarded by Sufi poets as barriers to divine contemplation,

and therefore to be avoided. This kind of vision, not uncommon among other Sufi poets, led them to consider everything as mere images of that supreme beauty which was the goal of all their quests. This notion in turn led to a symbolic emphasis in much of Sufi poetry. Divine love, the main object of mystical experience, found an expression in human love, and images borrowed from secular literature were abundantly used to describe mystical experiences. When physical love became the primary motif of mystical symbolism, wine and the tavern constituted its other elements, and all played a considerable role in the later development of mystical literature.

The cult of love was considered a Sufi way to purification of the heart. Does not even physical love require an utmost altruism without which there can be no true love? But when Sumnūn al-Muhibb (d. 913) maintains that love is the foundation of the way to God, and thereby raises it above the gnosis, he means that disinterested love in which the Sufi can find a bridge to pass to the realm of spiritual love.⁶⁰

Lovers of this kind admire, adore, and enjoy the object of their love as something intrinsically precious and worthy of worship. And it is just this point which divides the formal ascetic who worships his God through fear or hope and the mystic devotee whose worship is only for God's sake.

With this disinterested love there remains but a few steps to the divine love in which the final connection demands total sacrifice of the lover. An allegorical tale of the poet ^cIraqī (d. 1309) illustrates this final annihilation of the lover in such a disinterested love. There was a miserable man, he recounts, who had spent most of his days amidst the ash-heaps of bath-house furnaces. He went once on an excursion to a field--a green field with beautiful meadows and fragrant flowers. Suddenly a beautiful youth passed by, mounted on a horse, as though going hunting. The poor man was immediately seduced by his beauty and fell in love with him. There was, of course, no hope for the poor beggar in such a love affair with a prince, and this hopeless passion kept him for some time in a desperate state.

Two weeks passed, with the wretched man knowing no way to find his beloved prince. One day the youth reappeared in the field, in hunting garb, riding his beautiful horse, and the poor man had a strange idea as to how to gain his desire. He secretly slaughtered a deer, clad himself in its hide, and exposed himself in such a way that the prince took him for a deer. Wounded by his beloved's

arrow, he fell down nearly lifeless. But when the prince came up to him and laid the wounded man's head on his own breast, the man passed away in joy and contentment.

The only path the poor beggar could find to his beloved prince was by sacrificing himself. Thus, also, the human soul, whose whole life has been spent in the ash-heaps of earthly pleasure, can enjoy connection with the godhead only through abnegation and sacrifice.⁶¹ That the object of love is represented here in a male person is significant in itself because the Sufis pictured the supreme beauty with rather virile characteristics, i.e., strength and jealousy. Moreover, this conception was also a reflection of homosexual tendencies developed in the course of time in their own wandering life, for homosexuality was not uncommon among the Sufis of monasteries. Even Sufi poets like Sanā'ī, Awḥad-i Kirmānī, and 'Irāqī are said to have had an inclination toward "Greek love," with Sanā'ī and Kirmānī reported to be specifically interested in the companionship of beautiful boys. It is said that 'Irāqī, when already a venerable shaykh, could often be found joking and playing with teenagers.

However, despite the enthusiasm with which wine had been praised in Persian Sufi poetry, no reliable instance of an actual orgy is ever recorded by these Sufi poets. Wine has occupied, from time immemorial, a central place in the religious rituals of the ancient Near East. In Persia, its invention goes back to a grandson of the legendary first king of Iran, Jamshīd, and the Persian wine-cult may be traced back to haomā, the mysterious intoxicating drink of pre-Zoroastrian time. In Greece, the God of Wine had an influential cult and the religion of the ancient Hebrews also contained elements of wine worship. The expression "blood of grapes" frequently occurring in Persian lyrics was used as early as in Genesis (49:11) and the Christian Eucharist sublimated it into an apt symbol of divine presence, the presence of one who called himself the "true vine" (John 15:1).

Long before Muslim Sufis began their Bacchic songs, Philo of Alexandria (Philo Judaeus) had compared mystical ecstasy with intoxication,⁶² and Plotinus also had found in the intoxication produced by wine, the symbol of spiritual contemplation, whence the concept of sober intoxication (sobria ebrietas).⁶³

Is there any possible relation between the Eucharistic symbolism of wine and the Sufi one? In Persian poetry, just as in early Muslim Arabic poetry, the Christian monastery is always connected with the custom of wine drinking, but even ancient Magians

are also credited with dealing in wine in countries where the prohibited wine could not openly be brought to market except by these religious minorities. Nevertheless, Muslim mystics usually depict Christians as far from enjoying this mystical intoxication and Ibn al-Fāriḍ tells us that these monastic folk could never truly achieve a mystical state in imbibing wine but only aspired to do so.⁶⁴

There was, however, a Qur'anic source for this symbolic wine in the reference to the pure drink of paradise (Qur'an, 76:21) which was interpreted by the Sufis as the beatific vision. It was mainly to this symbolic wine that the wine-songs of Ibn al-Fāriḍ and at least a considerable part of those of Ḥāfiẓ allude. This explains why Ibn al-Fāriḍ goes sometimes as far as to claim that not only is it no sin to drink that wine, as some allege, but it is a sin not to taste of it.

Thus, the use of this symbol for spiritual drunkenness was so common in the Islamic world that one might wonder if there was any prohibition against wine drinking in Islam. Moreover, exaltation of wine sometimes is so expressed that it is unclear whether the poet is presenting himself as a drunkard or a mystic. In the works of some Persian poets, especially Ḥāfiẓ and ʿIrāqī, the tavern is sometimes a tavern and sometimes a symbol of the Sufi monastery.

With all these symbols, Sufi poetry became essentially a symbolic literature in which God is called the beloved, spiritual ecstasy the wine, and the Sufi cloister the tavern. Such symbolic language has found explanations in a celebrated didactical poem of Shykh-i Shabistārī (d. 1320), who explicitly points out that in Sufi language "to become a haunter of the tavern is to be set free from self" and states that when the gnostics speak of wine, tavern, and sweetheart, these are all "symbols of the one reality, who in every form is manifested in his glory."⁶⁵

The same explanation is also given by Ibn al-ʿArabī, sometimes called the Doctor Maximus of the Muslim Sufis, whose Tarjūmān al-Ashwāq--a collection of Arabic poems dedicated to a Persian Beatrice--reveals a mystical symbolism that reminds us of Dante's songs. In an introductory chapter of this work, the great Shaykh tells us that all the profane works in it are to be considered as having esoteric meanings.

A third work in the same vein is the celebrated poem Tarjīḥ-band of the Persian poet Ḥāfiẓ of Isfahan (d. 1784). What Ḥāfiẓ

tells us in this connection has such close resemblance to the words of the Doctor Maximus that one wonders if the Persian poet was not actually influenced by the Arab master:

O Hātif, the meaning of the Gnostics, whom they sometimes call drunk and sometimes sober,
(When they speak of) the Wine, the Cup, the Minstrel, the Cupbearer, the Magian, the Temple, the Beauty, and the Girdle,
Are those hidden secrets which they sometimes declare in cryptic utterance.
If thou shouldst find they way to their secret thou wilt discover that even this is the secret of those mysteries,

"He is One and there is naught but He:
There is no God save Him alone!"⁶⁶

In any case, this poetical symbolism served as leitmotif for esoteric interpretations the Sufi theoreticians made of the ecstatic utterances of Sufis, a task begun with the well-known Sufi school of Baghdad and continued very elaborately by al-Sarrāj.

A careful interpretation of these "inspired paradoxes" was also undertaken by the Persian Rūzbihān al-Baqlī (d. 1209), whose work had some role in enhancing the posthumous prestige of Ḥallāj, and to Sufism in general. Explanations of these inspired paradoxes were based in particular on allegorical interpretations. These allegorical symbols, moreover, were used as the basic canvas in Sufi romances and epics, sometimes with ethical or didactical features. The well-known "Parliament of Birds" (*Mantiq al-Tayr*) of Ḥaṭṭār, a masterpiece of Persian Sufi literature, provides an outstanding example of this allegorical type.

In this allegorical poem of some 4,600 couplets, the Persian poet relates how the birds under the guidance and leadership of the hoopoe set out in quest of their sovereign, the Sīmurgh. This unseen sovereign of the birds was supposed to dwell in the Caucasus mountains beyond seven valleys, whose crossing would entail great dangers and difficulties. Of all the birds who set out on this dangerous quest, thirty birds survived to reach the sovereign's palace only to learn that the Sīmurgh (literally, "thirty birds") was nothing but their own thirty persons. In fact, they finally found their unseen sovereign in the reflection of their own faces and found themselves and the Sīmurgh to be one. That out of all

kinds of birds only thirty constituted the supreme being of Sīmurgh was due to the fact that only those who had really sought their God were destined to attain that perfection.

Thus this allegory represents the journey of the mystic Sufi to God. The hoopoe, which in the Qur'an is emissary of King Solomon to the Queen of Sheba, represents the Sufi shaykh, whose presence is supposed to be indispensable in the Sufi journey to God.

Ḥattār, of whom Shaykh-i Shabistarī said that his like would not reappear for a hundred centuries, was born in a village near Nishāpūr, an old citadel of Sufism. His father was a pharmacist (Ḥaṭṭār), a profession the poet also followed, whence his pen-name. He kept a pharmacy where he was consulted by patients to whom he dispensed prescriptions. When he felt called to follow the religious life, he gave up his profession, went on a pilgrimage to Mecca, then lived in seclusion, and spent most of his time in self-mortification, until he met his death at the hands of the Mongols during their sack of Nishāpūr. Ḥaṭṭār also wrote other longer mystical poems with a didactical character. His poetry, even if poetically inferior to that of Sanā'ī, is superior to it in charm and effect. With Sanā'ī and Rūmī he constitutes the summit of Persian mysticism. Ḥabd al-Rahmān Jāmī (d. 1492), though having equally great mystical gifts, has never been placed in their high rank.

Compared to the work of Ḥattār, the style of Sanā'ī seems a bit more didactical and turgid. It has nevertheless been highly appreciated by later Sufis, who probably found in the poet's personal conversion something extraordinary and divine. A professional panegyrist of the Ghaznavid court for a long time, he finally was disgusted by that silly work, did penitence, was converted to Sufism, renounced the world, and went so far as to walk barefooted in the streets.

He wrote several philosophical and lyrical poems and anticipated Dante in his description of a heavenly journey in a short poem called "The Journey of the Servants of God to the Place of Return" (*Sayr al-Cibād ila al-Ma'ād*). But his most famous work was "The Garden of Truth" (*Ḥadiqat al-Ḥaqīqah*), a long poem of some 10,000 couplets, divided into ten chapters dealing with mystical subjects. This great monument of Sufism is not, however, an even and homogeneous work. As the poet's death evidently left it unfinished, other posthumous works--all written in the same meter as the *Ḥadiqah* were probably incorporated. This explains the chaotic arrangement of the *Ḥadiqah* where some chapters do seem scarcely to be properly placed.

Sanā'ī's work was much esteemed by Rūmī and especially by Rūmī's first spiritual teacher--Sayyid Muḥaqqiq-i Tirmidhī. This eminent Sufi used to quote from the poet Sanā'ī in his own discourses, and Rūmī himself referred to or commented on Sanā'ī's work very often in his Mathnawī. The Ḥadiqah is a collection of long didactic chapters on Sufi subjects interspersed by tales sometimes of allegorical character. Some of these tales have been retold by Ḥaṭṭār or Rūmī, both of whom recognized in him a master and precursor.

Nevertheless, the climax of Persian Sufism, if not that of the whole Muslim world, was reached neither by Sanā'ī nor by Ḥaṭṭār but by Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, whose famous Mathnawī is one of the greatest literary monuments of all time. Jalāl al-Dīn, however, did not consider poetry and art as an object but as a means of expressing his explosive fervor and his unlimited passion.

His song of the reed-pipe, which opens the Mathnawī, reveals the complaints of the soul, whose separation from its divine abode is represented by the metaphor of the reed-pipe being cut off from its reed-bed. The whole of the Mathnawī--a long poem of some 25,631 couplets--may be considered an illustration of this idea. The reed-pipe represents the human soul, imprisoned in the earthly body, for which the final rescue lies in death. This is of course not the animal death with which animal life ends in this world, but the death of earthly desires, which leads to a spiritual rebirth.

Besides the Mathnawī, Jalāl al-Dīn also wrote lyrical poems--a collection of some 40,000 couplets--called the Dīvān-i Shams-i Tabrīzī. As a matter of fact, the unusual grandeur and depth of these lyrical poems echo the unequalled passion of the poet for his spiritual leader, to whose memory most of these poems have been dedicated.

That Ḥabīb al-Rahmān-i Jāmī (d. 1492) was the last great bard of classical Persian Sufism is beyond question. But his works are by no means to be considered as of a purely mystical character. He is rather to be placed in the same class as Niẓāmī Ganjavī and Amīr Khusraw, whose works, though profane, are not lacking in mystical spirit. As a matter of fact, Jāmī was converted to the Naqshbandī order in Khurasan but remained all his life a scholar and poet, rather than an ascetic mystic.

Nevertheless, his "Golden Chain" (Silsilat al-Dhahab) sounds at several points like the Ḥadiqah, though it lacks the unequalled vigor of Sanā'ī. His Salāmān-u Absāl is also an allegorical poem written after a well-known tradition of Muslim theosophy probably

begun by Avicenna. "Rosary of the Pious" (Subḥat al-Abrār) introduces a new meter for long poems on mystical subjects. His death, however, marks the end of the classical age of Sufi poetry and the works of such modern Sufis as Nūr Ali Shah and Ṣafī Ali Shah expose only a new kind of Sufi poetry, that of pure Shi'ite tendencies.

Prose works of Persian Sufis, though of a larger variety and quantity, are not of such great literary interest. This prose heritage consists of mystical sermons, theosophical dissertations, biographies, memoirs, and letters, of differing literary value. Among the earliest specimens of theosophical achievements, Hujwīrī's Kashf al-Mahjūb and Mustamlī's Sharḥ-i Ta'arruf⁶⁷ are typical. They contain nearly all the kinds of material to be found in later prose works of Sufis. As a matter of fact, such works as Miftāḥ al-Nijāt, Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah, Mirṣād al-^CIbād, and Maqṣad-i Aqṣā are later developments of this same tradition.

The same can be said of biographies and memoirs dealing with the lives and works of Sufi saints. ʿAṭṭār's Tadhkirat al-Awliā', undoubtedly based on works already at hand in his time, is the prototype of this genre, so that Jāmī's Nafahāt and other similar works are only continuations of the same tradition of ʿAṭṭār. Moreover, nearly every great shaykh of the past has found at least one admirer to write down his acts and sayings. Works like the Asrār al-Tawḥīd⁶⁸ on the life of Shaykh Abū Sa'īd and Maqāmāt-i Zindah-Pīl⁶⁹ on the works and life of Shaykh Aḥmad-i Jām are but two celebrated specimens of a whole genre. These biographies of saints are chiefly based on records of their acts and words taken down during their lives by their own disciples. Unfortunately, we do not possess a large number of these notes on the great shaykhs.

Nevertheless, there are quite a few preachers whose sermons have been written down and collected by their disciples in the well-known fashion of the old traditionalists. Al-Shahristānī and Sa'īdī are among non-Sufi preachers whose Persian sermons have been preserved. In the case of Rūmī we even have a collection of his familiar discourses, or "table talk," the content of which is best expressed by its title, "There is what is therein" (Fīhi ma Fīhi).⁷⁰

This custom of writing down the table talk of the shaykhs seems to have been current in Rūmī's circle, as collections were also made of the discourses of his two spiritual teachers, Sayyid Burhān-i Muḥaqqiq and Shams-i Tabrīzī, as of those of his father, Bahā'-i Walad. Among these, only those of Shams-i Tabrīzī have remained unpublished.

Although keeping personal diaries was not much in vogue among Persian Sufis, we are, nevertheless, in possession of one specimen which seems to be of a very original character--a large part of the intimate journal of Bahā al-Dīn Valad, the venerable father of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, who tries to analyze his daily acts and thoughts. What has led this celebrated saint to write down his deeds and thoughts was probably a desire to check his acts in order to avoid any offense to his religious conscience. We read in Ibn al-ʿArabī's *Futuhāt*⁷¹ that the teachers of that Spanish saint used also to write down all they did and said, and used to read it through after their nightly prayers. If Ḥarīth al-Muḥāsibī kept a journal, it was to account for his sins in order to perform formal penitence for them--whence his name, al-Muḥāsibī, "the accountant." Moreover, Ḥakīm-i Tirmidhī and Fadl-i Astarābādī wrote down their dreams, and Ibn al-ʿArabī kept a careful record of his mystical experiences in his Meccan revelations. But the case of Bahā al-Dīn Valad is somewhat different. Although it sometimes sounds like Bayazīd's "Ascension" and Niffārī's "Stages" in its ecstatic features, his work is unique in the freshness of his ideas and the depth of his analysis.

Among minor genres of literary prose the personal correspondence of some Sufis is also of some importance. The epistles of al-Junayd, and the letters of Abū Saʿīd shed new light on the development of Sufi doctrines. There also exist collections of letters and epistles belonging to both Ghazzālī and Rūmī, which have great literary value.

But the huge number of letters composed by ʿAyn al-Quḍāt deserve special mention. A spiritual disciple of Ghazzālī, this qāḍī of Hamadan was also a prolific writer. In addition to excellent quatrains, in which he is not inferior to Khayyām, he wrote theosophical works both in Arabic and Persian. As a Sufi teacher, moreover, he used to preach his ideas through long letters addressed to his few disciples and admirers. Among these admirers there was a vizier of the Saljuqs whose fall provided an opportunity to the hostile ulama of Hamadan to engineer the arrest of ʿAyn al-Quḍāt. He was arrested under suspicion of heresy, sent to Baghdad for trial, imprisoned there for some months, and returned to Hamadan to be executed, crucified and burned in 1127 A.D. In one of his most impressive letters, sent to the ulama of Islam while imprisoned in Baghdad, the poor qāḍī of Hamadan very explicitly claims his innocence and explains the esoteric meaning of the ideas for which his enemies have caused his arrest. This epistle, called "The Complaint of the Stranger," an English translation of which was recently published by A.J. Arberry, is one of the most brilliant works of the

and contains a brief but precise exposition of his teachings. ^ʿAyn al-Quḍāt is supposed to have written more than 120 letters, in Arabic and Persian, all dealing with mystical problems.

A parallel course in this method of teaching was followed by Qutb b. Muḥī al-Jahrumī, some four centuries later. This saintly leader is supposed to have founded a utopian community in Persia around the beginning of the Safavid period. He used to teach and lead his followers by means of correspondence--just as did ^ʿAyn al-Quḍāt. His letters, only a selection of which has been published, show that his socialistic community was located in a place called Ikhwān Ābād somewhere in the neighborhood of Jahrum. His letters are mostly addressed to his disciples in Ikhwān Ābād or to others concerning their spiritual problems, and are of considerable mystical and ethical interest.

V

Before the Sufi orders came into being, and especially in the early days of the ascetic movement in Islam, Sufism rather tended to individualism. Nevertheless, the early Sufis did not go so far as to detach themselves from social life and to abandon society as doomed to corruption and destruction. Temporary retirement or wandering in remote places did not always prevent them from taking part in congregational Friday prayer, in pilgrimages to Mecca and occasionally in holy wars. The performance of such religious duties, however, did not lead them to urge asceticism on other Muslims as a recipe for collective life. Even the Sufi story tellers (quṣṣāṣ) who used to threaten the common folk with descriptions of hell, urged only personal penitence and individual devotion. Unlike the Anchorites of Egypt and the Syrian Sons of the Covenant (Benāī Qeyāmā), no organization linked them in their ascetic endeavors.

The assumption that every person has a direct and personal connection with the godhead, and the conviction that there are as many ways to God as there are human souls, did not permit the fervent penitents--in revolt against the extravagances of the community--to spend their time on the salvation of others.

There were ascetics who avoided frequenting societies and markets, seeing in them barriers to disinterested devotion.⁷² To

an admirer who once expressed the desire to live for a while with the ascetic Shu^cayb b. al-Ḥarb, the pious man pointed out that worship does not permit collaboration and sharing.⁷³ Ibn al-Mubārak was asked what the heart's remedy was. "Not seeing men" was his answer. Another Sufi remarked that union with God is separation from all else and separation from all else is union with Him.⁷⁴ Hence the well-known Sufi definition for the gnostics: kā'in'n bā'in, i.e., a detached being, one who outwardly lives with men but is inwardly detached. This explains why some early Sufis like Rābi^cah and Ibrāhīm-i Adham did not endeavour to preach Sufism as a way open to all.

Nevertheless, the fact that the Sufi movement originated among common folk and represented a reaction against the rigid formalism of jurists and traditionalists made it more attractive for common people, and especially for the men of the bazaar. In fact, a number of Sufi teachers arose from among the bazaar people. Parasitism, occasionally in vogue among the ulama, was never heard of among early Sufis, who preferred to earn their daily bread by their own labor. It is no wonder then that out of some sixty persons Hujwiri named as the forerunners of Sufism, fifteen were connected to the crafts and business.⁷⁵

Uways al-Qarani was a shepherd; Ḥabīb b. Salīm was a shepherd; Bāyazīd was a water carrier; Sari al-Saqatī was a huckster; Shaqīq-i Balkhī was a merchant; Abū Ḥafs al-Nīshāpūrī was an ironsmith; Ḥamdūn al-Qaṣṣār was a laundryman; Al-Junayd was a glass dealer; Sumnūn al-Muḥibb was a date merchant; Abū Bakr al-Warrāq was a book dealer; Abū Sa^cīd al-Kharrāz was a haberdasher; Khayr al-Nassāj was a weaver; Abū al-^cAbbās al-^cAmulī was a butcher; Abū Ishāq al-Khawwāṣ was a date dealer; Abū Ḥamzah al-Baghdādī was a cloth dealer.

Among other celebrated Sufis there are also craftsmen and artisans of every kind, such as baker (khabbāz), barber (muzayyin), fisherman (sammāk), plasterer (jaṣṣāṣ), shoemaker (khaffāf, ḥadhdhā), donkey driver (khar-bandah), saddler (sarrāj), pharmacist (ṣaydal-ānī), flour dealer (daqqāq), and many others.

The conversion of some craftsmen to Sufism may have led to mass conversions of various local or provincial guilds and corporations, who would find in the new teaching moral support against the tedious formalism of the ulama, so alien to their psyche. But there remains the question whether this membership did not later serve as a stone weight attached to the bird's wing and thereby

prevent it from distant flight. Inasmuch as pure mystical experience is concerned, the answer must be affirmative.

Nevertheless, this was not the only factor in the later development of Sufism, and its effect appeared only in the course of time. It was with the conversion of artisans and craftsmen however that Sufism gained the concept of both brotherhood and initiation. This led to the idea that no individual can expect perfection in the Sufi path unless he is guided by an authoritative master--an idea evidently connected with traditions of both guild corporations and the Ismā'īlī Karmathians. But this notion was indeed essentially inconsistent with the original Sufi belief in personal and direct communication with God. Nonetheless, theoreticians soon appeared to incorporate the theory of sainthood (wilāyah), through which Sufism could develop Sufi orders.

That Abū Bakr, Ali, and especially Salmān-i Fārsī, have been credited by the Sufis as their patrons also bears witness to the influence of guild corporations in the development of the system of Sufi orders. All three were, of course, linked in one way or another to the concept of labor and craft. Abū Bakr is said to have continued his business even during his caliphate; Ali is reported to have been a hired worker in palm groves, and Salmān is believed to have lived by weaving reed baskets even when already the governor of Ctesiphon. Moreover, each of them represented qualities which common Muslims required for spiritual leadership: Abū Bakr was representative of orthodox faith, Ali the paragon of pious knighthood, and Salmān the prototype of sincere devotion.

Nevertheless, the individualist trend of early Sufism held some Sufi saints aloof from relations with common folk. It is true that later generations of Sufis found in Uways al-Qaranī an eponym for their individualist position also, but they themselves founded no actual order or sect and remained faithful to their original individualism. An early prototype of this group was the well-known Rābi'ah al-Adawīyah (d. 801). Even if some ascetics like Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Mālik-i Dīnār paid occasional visits to her, they were neither her disciples nor companions. Devotion to God with the utmost of disinterested love was the only result of her teaching. The following anecdote illustrates her stand in connection with formal ascetism: one day she was running along quickly, carrying fire in one hand and water in the other. When asked what she meant by such an action, she replied: "I am going to set fire to paradise and pour water on hell so that people will cease to worship God in the hope of paradise or from fear of hell."

Even if a similar procedure can also be found in the act of a legendary woman of Alexandria, one cannot help comparing the human aspect of this mystical stand with the fury of the religious position of a Catholic preacher who used to threaten sinners with the terrifying words of a German poet:

If hell were going out, then would I with any
breath blow up the last glimmering coals till they
should blaze up again into all the first fury of their
flame.⁷⁶

Rābi^Cah's disinterested love for God left no place in her heart for any other passion. She even had little concern either for the holy person of the Prophet or for the evil spirit of Satan. It is no wonder then that Sufis like her devoted little energy to preaching, much less to the founding of orders. There is no doubt, however, that there were also Sufis to whom, besides the beatific vision of heaven, the pious and honest life on earth mattered as well. The optional poverty which they professed attracted some oppressed people as a way to peace of mind. Whereas more sophisticated people resorted to medicine and other practical ways to cure their illnesses and difficulties, the common folk--possessing inadequate material resources--sought out Sufi saints to cure them and to be their mediators and advocates with God. This explains why the Sufi saints were more highly esteemed by common folk than the representatives of religious law or the governing class. That this situation did not hold true in Safavid Persia may be due to the fact that the representatives of religious law were not only agents of the ruling class but also representatives of the Hidden Imām to whom the ruling class also claimed connection.

In any case, instead of the scrupulous care the representatives of religious law urged in the actions of the bodily members in rituals, the Sufis advocated stress on the deeds of the heart. This also could have more attraction for impatient workmen who naturally had no time to worry about the scrupulous rituals required by formal jurists. The anti-intellectual position the Sufis held from time to time led them gradually to claim connection with the "unseen" (ghayb), and hence their esoteric interpretation of revelation.

Whereas moderate Sufis were trying to find traditional support for their mystical beliefs, there were also extremist Sufis who always sought mystical interpretations for religious traditions. They soon claimed that the outward acts were nothing more than symbols of the inward feelings. This sounded, indeed, similar to

Karmathian and Ismācīlī ideas, and despite the great divergences between the Sufis and these groups concerning the problem of teaching (ta^clīm), the theory of wilayah (sainthood) also worked to bring Sufism and Ismācīlīs together so that esoterism became a familiar common ground for both. The pilgrimage to Mecca, to mention only one instance, offers an interesting illustration of this affinity. Nearly the same esoteric interpretation advanced by the Ismācīlīs concerning the mysteries related to the Kaa'ba has been maintained by some Sufi teachers. There is, for instance, a well-known qaṣīdah in the Diwan of Nāsir-i Khusraw in which this Ismācīlī poet attempts to give an esoteric interpretation to every single process of the Islamic hajj. The poet describes therein how he goes out to meet and welcome a friend just returning from the pilgrimage. After the formal greetings he then starts to inquire of his friend about his pilgrimage. He asks him whether he had perceived the symbolic meaning of all the ritual acts he had performed. These symbolic meanings are, of course, what the Ismācīlīs think to be the actual meaning of such rites as ihrām, rajm, tal-bīyah, etc.⁷⁷

When the poor ḥājī remarks that he never perceived such hidden meanings for the rituals connected with the pilgrimage, the poet points out that he then has not performed a true pilgrimage, but has solely succeeded in going to Mecca, in seeing the Kaa'ba and in buying the fatigues of the desert for silver.

The same dialogue, in a shorter form, is reported by Hujwīrī to have occurred between al-Junayd and a friend.⁷⁸ The similarity of both dialogues is such that were not the Ismācīlīs credited with esoterism as one essential tenet of their creed, one would think that the poet had plagiarized the theme from his Sufi predecessor. This esoterism developed later into the strange belief expressed by some Sufis that religious law is only for common folk so that the elect Sufis are to be considered about it. Even though no particular person has been accused of such belief,⁷⁹ preachers of this opinion have been called ibāḥīs, "libertines," and criticized both by orthodox Sufis and orthodox ulama. This Sufi opinion also had an Ismācīlī flavor and was considered by some also to reveal some Manichaeian tendencies (zandaqah).

If the orthodox Sufis excluded these libertines from their brotherhoods, they also did not consider blameless the members of another unorthodox group called the "people of blame." This group did not consider religious law below their dignity but neither did they show great interest in its ordinance in public. Nevertheless,

they were supposed to observe religious law, though only in private. The "people of blame" not only paid little attention to their appearance but also manifested extreme indifference to the judgment of public opinion. On the contrary, they are said to have committed the most shameless deeds simply to draw upon themselves disapproving or unfavorable public opinion. They reportedly thought that public blame directed against them would have a great effect in making their devotion more sincere and more disinterested.

This kind of attitude, however, was not uncommon among Christians of the Near East. The famous story of Theophile and Mary as related by Syriac sources depicts these two holy persons so that they appear to be forerunners of the Muslim Malāmīs.⁸⁰ These two saints of the Syrian church are believed to have lived a long time publicly as buffoons and jesters of blameworthy appearance, whereas they secretly lived as real ascetics. This was of course in accordance with that maxim of the Christian faith which teaches believers not to pray in the streets "that they may be seen of men" (Matthew 6:5).

This Sufi school, however, did not survive its early shaykhs of the ninth and tenth centuries, and in the following centuries Sufis spoke of "blame" as a theoretical rather than practical tenet. The way in which Ibn al-ʿArabī and Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥawwī speak of "blame" does not suggest any allusion to an existing Sufi order. Even the so-called Malāmī order in the Ottoman Empire does not seem to have an actual connection with the old school of Khurasan. The notorious Shaykh Ḥamzah (d. 1575), to whom the founding of this order is attributed, is said to have been executed by Sultan Murad III for pro-Christian tendencies.

Was there really any connection between the "people of blame" and the order called Fityān in later times? Contrary to what A. ʿAfīfī⁸¹ has advocated in favor of such a connection, B. Furūzānfar finds little evidence for it. He points out that while the Fityān boasted about their good deeds, the "people of blame" concealed their good deeds and used to draw public blame on themselves.⁸² Nevertheless, the Fityān movement seems to have originated from the connection between Sufism and the guild corporations--sometimes even through the ʿAyyārs.

Originally connected with the sacred memory of Imam Ali--whome the Prophet allegedly recognized as the unequalled Knight of Islam--the movement was encouraged, if not actually conducted, by some branches of Alids who considered themselves the true

representatives of this sacred knighthood. That the Caliph Naṣir (d. 1225), who was credited with pro-Alid tendencies, placed himself at a later time at the head of this wide-spread organization may bear witness to its link with the Alids and Abbasids. Among the Sons of Imam Ali, Muhammad al-Ḥanafīyah, who dreamed of his father's knighthood, had connections with the forefathers of the Abbasids. That a Shi^cite sect called Kaysānites gathered around his name and became the nucleus of Abbasid propaganda is significant because not only does Muhammad al-Ḥanafīyah develop later as the hero of an epic popular among artisans and craftsmen but also Abbasid propaganda was connected with the guild corporations of Kūfah (for which reason the warrior aristocracy of the Arabs had always despised them).

These so-called freed-men, mainly non-Arab peasants, artisans and craftsmen, had marked the anti-Umayyad movements of both al-Mukhtār and Abū Muslim with their Kaysānite tenets. These provincial and urban classes of non-Arab stock, regarded for a long time by the tribal Arab nobility as non-qualified for the noble task of war, proved their organized power in their anti-Arab revolts. They had inherited, in fact, a certain organizing experience from the past days of Madā'in (Ctesiphon) when their fathers had had to deal with corporation problems such as tax distributions under the Sasanians. The barber-governor of post-Sasanian Madā'in, Salmān-i Fārsī, may have served as a link in this supposed Madā'in-Kūfah connection.

The predominance of artisans and craftsmen in the formation of Abū Muslim's partisans was so great that the general and his soldiers were all, not without some derision, surnamed the Saddlers. Even later it was a coppersmith of Sistan who raised almost the first open revolt against the Abbasids in Persia, this time with the cooperation of a new organization, the ^cAyyārs. These were voluntary warriors, grouped together under a knighthood ethic with a discipline similar to that of guild corporations, putting the "initiate" under the tutelage of the "pioneer," and appearing in urban and rural centers either for the purpose of holy wars or simply to represent a front of opposition against local powers.

Later, when Sufism could gain some converts among craftsmen and artisans, these loosely organized groups--sometimes also called rindān--found their way into Sufi ranks, and hence the frequent use of rind in Persian poetry as a synonym of Sufi. Clad in soldiers' uniforms and bound by almost no special discipline, the secular elements of ^cAyyārs, the true libertines as the epithet rind may depict them, were often a real threat to the security of towns, especially during peace time. This explains why the soldier garb

inspired such hatred and terror among common folk that the "people of blame" used it to deter the public from respecting and esteeming them.

However, the principles of the ^CAyyārs concerning generosity and chivalry sometimes reached such a high standard that the moral ideals of a certain Nuḥ-i ^CAyyār seems as pure and disinterested as those of the "people of blame."⁸³

That some shaykhs of the Malāmīs--Aḥmad b. Khadrūyah for instance--used to wear soldier's garb⁸⁴ instead of the Sufi wool garment may give support to the supposed connection of the "people of blame" with the ^CAyyārs, who had made a rule to wear warrior garb and to call their chieftain by military titles like sarhang (colonel) and sardār or sālār (general).

The ^CAyyār-Fityān connection led them later to frequent participation in holy wars and to occasional retirement into ribāṭs--frontier barracks built for war use in remote frontiers of the world but gradually becoming peaceful dwellings for ascetic retirement. Moreover, this connection developed in the athletic traditions of Persian gymnasiums (zūrkhānahs) where the Imam Ali was highly respected as the sovereign of men (shāh-i mardān), and a poet of Khwārizm, called Pūryā-i Vālī or Qitālī, was honored as their most eminent Sufi-athlete. Afterwards the wrestling exercises also became a symbol of their inward struggle or spiritual war against the Devil. The organization of the gymnasium offers striking affinities with the Sufi khāniqāhs and their initiation rituals bear likeness to that of the Fityān and the Sufi orders alike.

Another survival of the Sufi-^CAyyār tradition was the well-known Ḥaydarī-Ni^Cmatī quarrels in Safavid and Qajar Persia, which ceased only one hundred years ago. This was a Persian version of the notorious Gwelf-Ghibellines conflict, which divided the chief cities of Safavid Persia into wards and excited continual outbursts of violence between quarters and parties.⁸⁵ That both parties were credited with Sufi eponyms--the Ḥaydarīs with a certain Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar and the Ni^Cmatīs to Shah Ni^Cmatallāh--denotes their relations with the Sufi-^CAyyārs.

Despite what some European travellers have noted, the custom was by no means an invention of Shah ^CAbbās the Great but a continuation of the town-wars (shahr jang), accounts of which may be found in historians of pre-Safavid times.⁸⁶

That the ethical value of Fityān tenets was of a higher stature than that of the ʿAyyārs is, indeed, beyond question. The futūwah, being more urban, seemed more refined than the ʿAyyārs, who offered something more rude. Nevertheless, the early Sufis recruited converts from both. Thus, for instance, whereas Fuḍayl b. ʿIyāḍ was a highwayman, Hamdūn-i Qaṣṣār was an artisan of urban origin. The doctrine of "blame" was greatly appreciated by the latter who is reported to have said, "Blame is the abandonment of welfare."⁸⁷

Did the Qalandarīs continue the traditions of the "people of blame"? It is indeed, in the late tenth century, during the decline of the "people of blame" as a group, that the earliest mention of Qalandars occurs in Sufi literature. They also used to wear soldier's garb, though not as a special costume. Moreover, they regarded their opposition to rigid formalism as a revolt against hypocrisy. Nevertheless, the Qalandars seem to have been more cynical in social behavior and less careful in religious matters than the "people of blame." The use of hashish and henbane was widespread among them, and instead of soldier's garb they sometimes wore the skins of lions or leopards to inspire fear and respect among rustic folk. Moreover, contrary to most Sufi orders, whose members had long hair or wore felt caps, they used to shave their heads, beards and even eyebrows. They probably represented, at least in their prime, a reaction against the order system already in vogue, and especially against their rigid and too formalistic regulations.

VI

The inner light on which the Sufis had based their theory of knowledge developed gradually into a rationalist anti-rationalism. Speculative reason was considered by the Sufis as unqualified for the quest of the unseen and regarded as no more than a useful tool for getting on in the world. Confined to such an elementary level, speculative reason was considered alien to the sublime truth of the unseen, which was deemed beyond its access.

The theologians and the philosophers who use speculative reason in search of higher truth are compared by one Sufi thinker⁸⁸ to the blind, who use their sense of touch in order to get an idea of what is to be seen. This attempt is, of course, a failure since it cannot result in certainty.

Moreover, what can the blind man's touch grasp out of the infinite reality that is the unseen? A very superficial and vague idea, indeed. To illustrate this point they often quote a well-known parable, probably of Indian origin, a Pali version of which goes back to the second century A.D.⁸⁹ The parable, which appears in Ghazzālī, Hadiqah, Mathnawī, and a prose work of ʿAzīz al-Nasafī, with rather different details and applications, tells us that once a group of blind men came to an exhibition of elephants to find out what an elephant was like. As they could not see the animal, each one felt it with his hand and got a different idea of it. One felt only its trunk and found the beast to be like a waterspout, another handled its ear and pictured it to be like a fan. A third who had rubbed against its leg thought the elephant to be similar to a pillar, and the fourth who had laid his hand on its back imagined it to be something like a throne. It is true that each one of these persons in some sense spoke the truth, but the idea they got of its whole was inevitably wrong. The palm of the blind man, to which is likened the speculative reason of individuals, cannot cover the whole truth. That kind of knowledge, inaccessible to speculative reason, is such that once taught by the teacher, the disciple's conception of it may be equal to that of the teacher,⁹⁰ whereas the knowledge acquired by the heart cannot be taught, and each disciple and teacher must have his own taste of it--hence its appellation ʿilm-i dhawqī. Such is the higher knowledge that the Sufis call maʿrifah or ʿirfān, i.e., gnosis, and claim to be above speculation and teaching. It is not to be acquired by reasoning and speculating but by emptying the heart of thought, and by reaching to it for spiritual gifts.⁹¹

This explains why the Sufis don't regard bookish knowledge as necessary for high knowledge, and urge only purification of the heart.⁹² That learned people like ʿAyn al-Quḍāt and Jalāl al-Dīn Mawlawī chose some illiterate folk like Shaykh-i Barakah and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Zarkūb as their spiritual leaders indicates the minimal concern they had for speculation and formal learning. We are told that neither Shaykh-i Barakah nor Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn could speak good Persian, but only dialect or slang. As a matter of fact, the spiritual teacher has no teaching role but has only to assist the disciple in his spiritual journey and to keep him within the path.

It is no wonder then that a well-known Sufi thinker like ʿAzīz al-Nasafī points out explicitly that the "knower" whom one may trust in the Sufi path is neither to be found among the bookish preachers nor even among the Sufis of convents, who are of self-conceited and egotistical nature.⁹³ In other words, the role of

the Sufi spiritual teacher is rather like that of the Socratic Maetic, who is to help the disciple's heart to give birth to its inner gnosis, and nothing more. If some spiritual teachers, especially after the establishment of orders, have been regarded as something more, that is rather in connection with their sainthood and with their place in the Sufi hierarchy of saints.

Sufi knowledge derives from the heart, on which the whole psychology of the Sufis is based. By the heart, they conceived nearly the whole of man's inner life, including knowledge and action. This concept was based on the Qur'an,⁹⁴ but nearly all the Semitic peoples of the pre-Islamic Near East had a similar concept. Thus, not only in the Old Testament Psalms,⁹⁵ but also in the New Testament,⁹⁶ the heart denotes the inner man. It is used in nearly the same sense throughout the whole of the biblical writings. Even the "heart of God" has been used⁹⁷ to denote the center of divine designs and will.⁹⁸

The Sufis considered the heart as both the theologian's ratio and intellectus, in evidently the same way that the French mystic Pascal⁹⁹ often made use of it, perhaps with still greater stress on its intuitive character. To the Sufis the heart is rather a transcendental subtlety (latifah-i rabbānī), connected in a mysterious way to the "cone-shaped fleshy organ situated in the left side of the chest." The Sufi knowledge has, of course, no connection with this physical heart.

The relationship between its psychological aspects and its physiological functions has led the Sufis to consider the heart the real meaning of the glass lantern (zujājah) installed in the mysterious niche (mishkāṭ), allegorically depicted in the Qur'an (24:35). The Sufis, of course, interpreted the Qur'anic niche as the human body and identified the Qur'anic lamp (miṣbāḥ) therein as the heart with its hidden innermost aspects.¹⁰⁰

Among these hidden aspects which form the "wonders of the heart," the Sufis make special mention of the spirit (rūḥ), the secret (sirr), the hidden (khāfī), and the most hidden (akhfā), all concepts being borrowed from revelation. These are considered by some Sufis to be merely different appellations of one and the same thing,¹⁰¹ whereas others view them as ordered according to their increasing separateness from the body or just in accordance with the dependence of each element to its superior.¹⁰² They, however, may be taken as vague reflections--or rather as a mystical expression--of the modern psychological concepts of the conscious and the subconscious.

That the heart has been compared by the Sufis to a light in the midst of the well of nature¹⁰³ bears allusion to the fact that the heart should not be regarded simply as a mirror that reflects the images it receives, but rather as a well, the clearness of which comes from its own depths,¹⁰⁴ and which only need be kept clear and pure. Like the well in which the beautiful face of Yūsuf was reflected, the heart also reflects the beauty of the divine beloved, for whom the heart of the believer is a favorite site.¹⁰⁵

This explains why the inner light, being of a divine nature, expels all other knowledge. As a matter of fact, other knowledge comes only from physical senses whereas that of the heart comes directly through the world of divine certainty and remains beyond any doubt.¹⁰⁶ Thus, conceived as a living mirror endowed with thought and feeling, the heart reflects the divine truth, the possessions of which realizes the real essence of man (ḥaqīqat-i ādamī).

This real essence of man is the gnosis through which the heart can consume its earthly part in the divine essence. This final annihilation of the earthly part of the heart into the divine essence is to be realized, according to Sufis, by the process of the purification of the heart. For this purpose, the Sufi has to watch the heart very carefully and to keep it from being darkened by excessive connection to earthly desires. Hence the perpetual watching of the heart practiced by the Sufis, for which reason they call themselves the "people of the heart." This continuous watching of the heart provided the Sufis with the opportunity to peruse the inner man and to observe its changes and evolutions. They were so scrupulously aware of this continuous change of the heart that they thought its name (qalb) to be derived from the very root that means "change."¹⁰⁷ It was this perusal of the heart which led them to distinguish between time (waqt), occurrence (khāṭir), state (ḥāl), and station (maqām) in their mood. These terms are of frequent use in Sufi literature and bear witness to their deep experience of psychological problems. By "time" they mean the spiritual instant in which the heart enjoys the present with no memory of the past and no thought about the future. It differs from what ordinary folk think in that Sufi time is filled with the thought of God whereas the common people may feel the happy instant empty from any concern. Besides this, the present instant is either under the pressure of a spiritual "state" or a spiritual "station." Concerning these two kinds of mood, Hujwīrī¹⁰⁸ remarks that the "state" has overwhelming supremacy over "time" and makes it happy or unhappy. The "occurrence" (khāṭir) is a passing thought which comes to the mind and is quickly removed.¹⁰⁹

Sufis do not abandon their watch over the heart even in sleep. Yet they do not really put much stress on the unreal character of dreams. The difference between sleeping and waking is, according to a Sufi writer,¹¹⁰ like the difference between the feelings of a person who has seen everything during the night by light and his feelings when the sun rises and he experiences everything as it was, but in a stronger light. This explains why they called their veridical visions "the happening" (waqī'ah), whether asleep¹¹¹ or awake.¹¹² The dream was considered by most Sufi shaykhs as the usual path to a Sufi miracle--a kind of inspiration occurring especially to Sufis. The explanations they used to give of dreams were sometimes of Platonic or Indian origin. For instance, according to al-Ghazzālī and Jalāl al-Dīn Mawlawī, the belief that the soul abandons the body during sleep and roams where it likes can be traced to the Upanishads.¹¹³ Nevertheless, the Sufis based their own explanations on prophetic and divine traditions.

In fact, the stress placed on the belief in the prophetic character of dreams is an important though not exclusive feature of Sufism. In a dream, the soul was believed to wander in higher spheres, during which it received directions and inspiration. The role that dreaming played in the spiritual life of Sufis suggests Babylonian (Gilgamesh) and Zoroastrian (Ardāy Vīrāf) influence. The Sufis had faith in the truth of dreams and founded a part of their mystical revelation on it.

A whole series of mystico-psychological experiences was revealed to the Sufis in the course of these inspections of the heart. They distinguished between "absence" and "presence," between "contraction" and "expansion." They differentiated between various degrees of knowledge, such as consciousness, unconsciousness, certainty, etc., and felt that all this intuitive knowledge was a result of their inward experiences. The beatific vision supported by both revelation and tradition--especially in the form of accounts of nocturnal ascent--was also considered by the Sufis as a result of gnosis.

Divine manifestation (tajallī) was believed to occur both in essences and attributes (tajallī-i dhāt wa ṣifāt). This, however, did not mean that a creature could actually be identified with God. Even the well-known comparison of the molten iron and fire, current almost from the early Christian period,¹¹⁴ illustrating man's annihilation in the godhead, does not presuppose the change of essence.¹¹⁵

The absence of mind (ghaybat) in which condition the heart forgets all except Allah, expressed on the other side by the presence of God (ḥuḍūr), as well as the contraction of the heart (qabḍ) in the state of being veiled from the divine presence, and its expansion (baṣṭ) in the state of revelation, all are preparatory to the beatific vision that leads to the mystical experience in which the mystic is unconscious of his self and conscious solely of God. It is in this way that he finally rids himself of the Satanic scatteredness (tafriqah) and reaches the apostolic state of concentration (jamʿ) in the divine presence: a long and painful way for a poor human to attain the beatific vision!

Another result for the Sufis of their continuous watch over the heart was a moral system based on the careful analysis of human moods and characters. They used this analysis also for the purification of the heart, i.e., its moral purification. The purification of the heart as practiced by Sufis often led them to examine themselves very carefully in order to detect any trace of hypocrisy or latent polytheism, and by this self-examination they acquired, among other practical benefits, a secure comprehension of the human heart. It was this knowledge that gave them success in gaining more followers and that enabled them to found their endeavors (mu-jāhidāt) on psychological and ethical considerations.¹¹⁶

Most of their moral system, however, was based on the practical emphasis by Sufi shaykhs on certain virtues to be sought or certain vices to be fought. Abū Sāʿid Kharrāz, for instance, urged that trustfulness (ṣidq) and sincerity (ikh-lāṣ) should be observed in all deeds and thoughts.¹¹⁷ But Abū al-Ḥusayn Nūrī insisted that the preference of others to oneself (ithār) was to be regarded as the cornerstone of all ethical and religious acts.¹¹⁸

The most elaborate system that the Sufis produced in ethical knowledge was Ghazzālī's work, whose influence on Islamic thought was unequalled. According to his theory, because man's salvation is in his spiritual perfection, he must permit the divine part of his being--his heart--to become more developed and vital. This aim may be attained only by morality based, not on philosophical speculation, but on following the way of the prophets and saints--the religious path of the orthodox Sufis.

The ethics of these orthodox Sufis was by no means a pessimistic one. The horrible hell in which Maʿarrī and Khayyām had suffered did not offer such a disheartening perspective to Ghazzālī and Mawlawī. One immediate result of their quasi-panteistic ideas was their optimism. When the whole universe becomes perfect in

itself, everything therein must also be a perfection in its context.¹¹⁹ Thus, the world of the Sufi does not offer itself as the valley of tears that the former monks and ascetics depicted. Even human beings are so tightly connected in one body in such a world that, if one member is suffering from a pain, his pain, to use the words of Sa^cdī,¹²⁰ will leave no rest for the other members. Amidst all the horror of the Crusaders and the Mongols, did this message not offer new hope for the human heart?

Neither wealth nor women were regarded by the orthodox Sufis as traps of the devil. Concerning worldly wealth, the well-known debate which Sa^cdī had with his rival¹²¹ was discussed everywhere. The debate centered on whether the rich man who prays to his God and avoids what religious law prohibits represents a higher ideal than the poor man who faces dire needs and fails to follow religious laws strictly. The orthodox Sufis held that wealth was not bad in itself; what was bad was that it diverted man from his God. In an oft-quoted passage of the *Mathnawī*,¹²² the poet likens wealth to water in its relationship with a boat. Whereas water beneath the boat supports it, if it comes inside the boat it may destroy it. The same is to be said of wealth. If one's heart is not attached to it, great support may be derived from it, but once love of it enters the heart, wealth destroys the heart's purity.¹²³

Such a convenient rationale was of course exploited by Sufi shaykhs who were the spiritual kindred of some medieval popes. This explains why a famous shaykh like Abū al-Mafākhīr-i Bakharzī (d. ca. 1378) could boast of his poverty even though he was wealthy enough to dedicate from his own possessions tens of villages and hundreds of landed properties to the *khāniqāh* of his own grandfather.¹²⁴

With women, the case was the same. The idea of celibacy was evidently so alien to the life of orthodox Sufis that even the rumors that Abū 'Abd Allā b. al-Khafīf had contracted four hundred marriages,¹²⁵ or that Shaykh Aḥmad-i Zindah Pīl had married a fourteen-year old girl while in his eighties, caused no great scandal.

Moreover, even music and dance could not be excluded from the program that the orthodox Sufis had planned for the purification of the heart. As a matter of fact this custom, called "audition" (*samā'*), was considered one of the main features of Sufi life.¹²⁶ Abū al-'Alā' al-Ma^crrī finds gluttony to be another of their features. The stories told about Abū Sa^cīd-i Abū al-Khayr provide illustrations of both characteristics. Abu Sa^cīd's enthusiasm for music and dance made his disciples precursors of the

whirling dervishes. Nevertheless, contrary to what biographers of Abū Saʿīd have remarked, Imam Qushayrī did not condemn "audition" absolutely.

Despite the objection of opponents, however, "audition" held an obvious attraction for the ordinary Sufis. So, not only in the social hall (jamāʿat khānah) of the khāniqāhs, but also in the large halls of private houses in nearly all medieval Muslim cities in the Near East and elsewhere, did the lively activity of the Sufi "auditions" take place. Drums, cymbals, and reed-pipes in their oriental varieties were played during these performances. The poems sung or recited by qawwālān were usually accompanied by exclamations or the moving of heads or limbs. The Sufis danced, moved around, jumped, clapped hands and gradually forgot themselves. Some wept, others beat on their faces. One would shriek and another would tear his garments or take them off. A shaykh of Baghdad is said to have compared the Sufis in the "audition" to flocks of sheep attacked by wolves.¹²⁷ According to Sufi thinkers, the object of the Sufis in listening to the music was not solely pleasure and delight, but, rather, the inward feeling of something close to their hearts. Ecstasy already existed and could only be strengthened by hearing the music.¹²⁸ Thus, the "people of the heart," as the Sufis liked to call themselves, based on the heart not only their faith and knowledge, but even their pleasure and recreation.

VII

With the development of the system of orders, a theory of sainthood was also developed by the Sufi shaykhs, based mainly on a pyramid-shaped hierarchy of saints. This was particularly needed in a period when the Sufi orders required an internal measure by which to check their spiritual achievements. Since the saints were likened to the Qur'anic companion-teacher of Moses, whose words were to be obeyed without any argument,¹²⁹ and since they were occasionally compared to the mountain echo of God's voice,¹³⁰ the shaykhs of khāniqāhs, who generally envisioned themselves at the top of the pyramid, acquired undisputed authority. This, of course, strengthened the rigid discipline of the khāniqāhs,¹³¹ without which no order could exist. Although the position of the top man--or the top men--of the hierarchy had on occasion been secretly and timidly disputed even among some early Sufis,¹³² it was especially in later times that a significant number of shaykhs insisted on their exclusive superiority as the top saint.

A theory of sainthood had of course existed in Islam long before the orders came into being, though it fell upon the Sufi orders to develop it later and to give it practical value. The concept of sainthood in Islam was perhaps as old as Islam itself; the Qur'an¹³³ speaks of the saints (awliya-i 'allah) as the friends of Allah, who will not be afraid or subject to grief. Much has been related in the traditions concerning these "friends of God," but nothing in particular in support of their ability to work miracles. As a matter of fact, there is no claim of miraculous power even for the Prophet himself in the Qur'an, even though the Qur'an itself is claimed to have the miraculous character of divine revelation. Nevertheless, Muslim creeds supported by later traditions speak of prophetic miracles as performed by Allah in order to prove the authenticity of his Prophet. Theologians styled as miracles (mu'jizah) every supernatural act performed by a prophet which no challenger can duplicate. Nevertheless, the devil (shaytan), pharaoh (fir'awn), and the anti-Christ (dajjal) are also reported to have performed some supernatural acts. These were not considered by Muslim theologians as acts of divine grace, but rather as what may be called divine deception (istidraj) to lull them into false confidence for a while.¹³⁴

As for the Sufis, they didn't fail to offer excuses even for Satan and the pharaoh. True that the faith of Satan and the pharaoh had been discussed long before the Sufis, by various sects like the Kharijites, Murji'ites and Mu'tazilites,¹³⁵ but the Sufis went occasionally as far as expressing sympathy--if not admiration--for them. Thus, not only was the pharaoh's dispute with Moses regarded as being based on surface and color by Jalāl al-Dīn Mawlawī,¹³⁶ but Ibn al-ʿArabī went as far as declaring the pharaoh a saint.¹³⁷

As for Satan, the Sufis looked on him as a true lover who had given his reverence only to his beloved, whence his obstinate refusal to prostrate himself before Adam. This is what he himself explains to us in a passage of the Mathnawī,¹³⁸ where Jalāl al-Dīn gives him the opportunity to justify himself. In his Tā Sīn al-Azāl wa al-Iltibās,¹³⁹ Hallāj recognized in pharaoh and Iblīs (Satan) his own teacher and declared them to be true knights in divine love.¹⁴⁰ Ahmad al-Ghazzālī asserts¹⁴¹ that everyone who does not learn the true monism (tawhīd) from Satan is an atheist. According to ʿAyn al-Quḍāt, this poor, damned being was in fact a passionate lover who did not hesitate to call contempt and blame down upon himself, for his beloved's sake.¹⁴²

That Sufi speculation provided the two damned characters with such a paradoxical but brilliant defense naturally incited the

ulama's wrath against them. Did this sympathy for the devil, taught so enthusiastically by Sufi preachers, have any relation to the so-called devil worshipping Yazīdīs? That particular question requires further study,¹⁴³ but that this position increasingly exposed the Sufis to the hostility and suspicion of orthodox Muslims is beyond doubt.

In fact, the concept of divine deception (istidrāj) requires that Satan and pharaoh should be considered mere tools for the fulfillment of God's will.¹⁴⁴ Indeed, their deeds were in full agreement with God's foreknowledge of them. Whether obedient or disobedient to God, they were carrying out his eternal will in the way decreed by Him. Since their disobedience was eternally decreed by divine will (mashīyah, irādah), how could they obey? Moreover, true lovers delight in the anguish their beloved may inflict upon them. If it is true that the lover's pleasure is to be the means of the expression of his beloved's will, then Satan and the pharaoh cannot be recognized as anything else.

To return to sainthood and the gift of the miracle: whether this supernatural power was or was not bestowed upon the friends of God was always a controversial point for various sects and groups. Whereas the Hashīwīyahs maintained that such special privilege may have been conferred on some pious people of the past, but that such privileged people no longer exist, the Muṭtazilites thought that no Muslim can be more privileged than another, and therefore there are neither special friends of Allah nor any kind of supernatural deeds to be performed by them.¹⁴⁵ The free thinkers (zindīqs) denied that even things contrary to the usual course of things can happen. The orthodox Muslims (Ashḥarīs) thought it evidently possible, as did some philosophers like Avicenna¹⁴⁶ and Ibn Khaldūn.¹⁴⁷ Nevertheless, al-Bīrūnī is sceptical on this point when he tells us that all people who hold doctrines like incarnation (ḥulūl) and identification (ittahād) and who live in extreme asceticism are naturally disposed to claim things that are logically unacceptable.¹⁴⁸

Providing a welcome answer to a natural need of the ordinary man, the belief in saints and their miraculous power spread throughout the whole Muslim world. Its influence in Muslim territories became so great that in India it gave birth to the strange cult of Panchon Pīr, the worship of five elders, which spread among some Indian castes that were partly or wholly Hindu,¹⁴⁹ but who enlisted some Sufi saints like Bahā al-Ḥaqq, Shah Shams-i Tabrīz and others, among the varying lists of their five elders.

The great popularity of the early ascetics had left such an impact on the memory of the common folk that they gradually became centers of a cult--with their tombs serving as its temples. Frequenting graves and especially those of pious men was always regarded as a source of blessing (barakah) and spiritual profit (fayd). In spite of numerous traditions against performing prayers near the tombs,¹⁵⁰ the tombs of some pious people became sanctuaries with domes (gubbahs) upon them and with gardens (rauḍah) around them. A number of tomb-mosques (mashhads) were erected in the course of time, especially around the tombs ascribed to early martyrs, prophets, Alids, miracle workers and even great ulama. In the case of Sufis they often became central monasteries (khāniqahs).

The holy men buried in these tomb-mosques and khāniqāhs were believed to be spiritually alive, even though bodily entombed. Miraculous powers were ascribed to their earth (turbat), to their shadow, and to their names.¹⁵¹ This supernatural power was first accorded to these dead immortals and was gradually extended to their spiritual heirs, the Sufi shaykhs. This miraculous power ascribed to Sufi shaykhs, and occasionally also to some pious ulama, included unusual gifts like thought reading, telepathy, prophecy, and hypnotic power. They are believed, moreover, to possess other extraordinary powers such as the ability to transform themselves into various shapes, to transport themselves instantly to distant places, to walk on the sea and on air, to transmute copper into gold and to check rains and floods. Their prayers are believed to be heard and accepted by God, their presence is considered to be beneficent and divine--hence the public belief in their blessings. This blessing (barakah) was occasionally sought in the dust on which they walked or rode.¹⁵² Nevertheless the trampling (daws) ceremonies, during which a number of dervishes lay down with their faces to the ground so that the shaykh could ride over them on horseback and thus give them blessing, was not performed anywhere except in Cairo and Syria, and that almost exclusively by Saʿdī brotherhoods in Mawlid ceremonies. This blessing by the shaykhs attracted the poor people to seek and place their spiritual welfare in the persons of these supposed holy men, who were believed to have a hand in the government of the universe.

Is there a possible link between this Sufi idea with that of the Brahman ascetics who thought also of gaining complete power over nature? The point is that the Brahmins earned this power through personal asceticism, whereas the Sufis thought to gain it chiefly through what they called divine grace (minnah). Moreover, the Muslim

saints considered this miraculous power as a temptation and did not like to boast of it.¹⁵³ This Sufi concept has scarcely any connection with the notion of charismata of the early Christian churches. The supposed phonetic and semantic resemblance seems to be accidental.

The miraculous power of the saints was regarded to have been derived chiefly from divine grace,¹⁵⁴ and bestowed upon the saint as a generous gift from God,¹⁵⁵ whence its name karāmah (generosity). The Sufis themselves regarded miracles as divine acts, believing that man could only perform a miracle as the representative of God.¹⁵⁶

Thus, whereas Avicenna and the theologians explained the miraculous acts of the saints on the grounds of the existence of still unsolved mysteries of nature, the Sufis themselves explained it as a result of their divine connections--their so-called vicegerency. That they are considered the governors of the universe, the men for whose sake the rain falls and the plants grow on the earth,¹⁵⁷ is evidently in their capacity of vicegerency, their quality of being "perfect men." The concept of the "perfect man" as represented in the works of Ibn al-^cArabī, ^cAbd al-Karīm Jīlī, and--with a slight difference--in the works of Jalāl al-Dīn Mawlawī, ^cAzīz-i Nasafī, and Shaykh-i Shabistarī denotes the highest type of human being, one who has realized his oneness with God. In other words, the perfect man was regarded as the universal spirit or the universal reason which united within himself inward and outward reality. He is the medium through whom God knows himself and his creatures, the microcosm that reflects the divine perfection with the whole macrocosm in his miniature being.

The Shi^cite Sufis based the concept of sainthood (wilāyah) on the word mawla, a mysterious epithet uttered by the Prophet in Ghadīr, on his way back from Mecca in 633 A.D. The perfect man was thus represented by the twelve Alid Imams. The cult of saints as conceived by the orthodox Sufis, however, was linked to the Prophet himself. There was not only a prophetic tradition, based on the authority of Ibn Mas^cūd, that would legitimize the hierarchical system of Sufi sainthood but also the concept of the nūr-i Muḥammadī i.e., the light of Muhammad, which would make him the central figure of Sufi sainthood. Conceived as the first creation, this "light of Muhammad" was regarded somewhat like logos in its twofold relation with God and the world. The side immanent to God received divine emanation that is transmitted to the world through the side adjacent to the world. Thus, while wilāyah (sainthood) is the God-side of "Muhammad's light," its world-side is the prophecy.

Does this mean that sainthood is superior even to prophecy, and that the prophets are lower than the saints? The orthodox Sufis held that the end of sainthood is only the beginning of prophecy,¹⁵⁸ but there were extremist Sufis who maintained that the importance of a prophet is due to his sainthood rather than his prophecy. It was a view similar to this that Hujwīrī¹⁵⁹ found in vogue among some extremist Sufis of Khurasan, and which he criticized as inspired by the devil. This extremist idea of sainthood was supported by a more extremist interpretation of the legend of Khidr and Moses. That Moses had still more to learn from this good "servant" of God¹⁶⁰ was considered by extremist Sufis to indicate the superiority of saints to prophets.¹⁶¹ Moreover, they claimed that saints receive inspiration directly from God, whereas prophets receive it only through an intermediary. The orthodox Sufis considered all these statements false. They maintained that the supposed superiority of Khidr to Moses is only a misunderstanding of the Qur'an since God has granted various spiritual gifts to various persons, and this does not mean that He has favored one of them over the other.¹⁶² The miracles of saints are granted to them by virtue of their obedience to the prophet of their time. Furthermore, while the inspiration of prophets is continuous, the inspiration of saints is only occasional. According to Hujwīrī the sublime contemplation which a saint reaches after he has attained his utmost perfection is only the first step of prophets.¹⁶³ Al-Sarrāj points out that Khidr could never bear a single moment of the illumination which Moses had enjoyed.¹⁶⁴ Thus, despite the preference of the extremist Sufis for sainthood, the orthodox Sufis held that one moment of a prophet is better than the whole life of a saint. In other words, the fleeting state (ḥāl) of a saint is the permanent station (maqām) of a prophet and that which is just a veil (ḥijāb) to a prophet is a spiritual station to a saint.

The immortal Khidr represents for the Sufis the prototype of the spiritual teacher whose knowledge cannot be taught by words but can be gained only by personal experience of the disciple himself. That he forbade Moses to ask him anything meant that the spiritual teacher could not explain all and that the disciple should wait until his own inner eyes were opened.¹⁶⁵ A regular or even occasional meeting with this typical teacher of saints has always been considered by Sufis as a privilege of the Sufi saints.¹⁶⁶

Although Ibrāhīm b. al-Adham is reported to have met Khidr several times on the way to Mecca,¹⁶⁷ and Hakīm al-Tirmidhī is said to have received a private lesson from him every day for several years,¹⁶⁸ another Sufi, Ibrāhīm al-Khawwās, refused to accompany

Khidr who desired his company, fearing that his mind might become engaged by someone other than God.¹⁶⁹ His refusal was later considered as progress toward a greater spiritualism.¹⁷⁰ This was what happened to the Mullā Shah Qādirī, a Sufi of India, who refused to accept assistance offered him by Khidr.¹⁷¹

The problem of sainthood had been discussed by early Sufis such as Ibrāhīm-i Adham and Bāyazīd, but it was through Hakīm al-Tirmidhī that it developed into a full theory. This philosopher-saint was mostly preoccupied with his visions and contemplations. His autobiographical sketches depict his wife also as being absorbed in mystical dreams. He was one of the great theoreticians of Islamic mysticism and tended toward a contemplative kind of philosophy. The only historical fact we know of his life is that, driven out from his native town, he fled to Nīshāpūr, where, in 898 A.D., he was still teaching. His last days, however, were evidently spent in Tirmidh where the ruins of his tomb are still visited.¹⁷² His theory on sainthood, as explained in his book on the "seal of the saints," which was later propounded by Ibn al-ʿArabī and others, divided the saints into two categories--common (Cammah) and particular (khāṣṣah), representing a compromise with formal asceticism. But whether he himself, his wife, or an imam had the "seal of the saints" is not clear.¹⁷³

The so-called lore of letters (ʿilm al-ḥurūf), probably linked in one way or another to the letters at the beginning of some Qur'anic suras, assigned numerical values to the Arabic letters and involved methods of predicting future events. It was occasionally called al-simā and al-jafr,¹⁷⁴ and together with al-kīmyā, it constituted the secret knowledge of the saints. Messianic ideas as expressed in Ḥurūfi-Nuṭṭawī sects, symbolic designations like yal-lālī for Ali and mīm for Muhammad, and esoteric expressions like ṭā sīn al-azal of Ḥallāj and hāmīm al-qidam of Abū Bakr al-Wāsiṭī, together with a considerable number of esoteric writings of cabalistic character, are the results of this occult lore of the saints.

The pyramidal hierarchical system, with some variation in classification and denomination, fixes the total number of living saints for each time at nearly the numbers of days in the lunar year (354 days), and thus imputes their supposed link with the cosmic order. Unknown to the public and even to themselves, the saints of the hierarchy are called "the invisible men" (riḡal al-ghayb). They are also called the abdāl, abdālān, and budalā, i.e., the substitutes, since when one of them passes away, his place is immediately filled by another saint.

There is, of course, great discrepancy concerning their categorization, with some systems divided into six grades and others into seven. The pseudo-prophetic tradition of Ibn-Mas'ūd divides them into a group of three hundred people with hearts like that of Adam, forty people with hearts like that of Abraham, seven with hearts like that of Moses, five people with hearts like that of Gabriel, three people with hearts like that of Michael, and one person with a heart like that of Israfil.¹⁷⁵

The head of the hierarchy is called qutb (the pole). He is the man whose help is sought by all--including saints. This explains why he is also called ghawth (succour), though this title has also been given on occasion to a saint immediately below the "pole" in the pyramid. Despite the fact that the saints are usually considered to be hidden from the public eye, some shaykhs of the khāniqāhs have claimed to have become the "pole" (succour), or "substitute." The comparison of the heart of the qutb to the heart of Israfil denotes that the former, like that archangel, will give new spiritual life to the dead. The concept of qutb has been connected by various Sufis to the idea of the Shi'ite imam, in whom some Shi'ite Sufis have also recognized the "seal of the saints."¹⁷⁶ The Shi'ite Sufis of today regard the Hidden Imam to be at the head of the hierarchy so that the great Shaykh of the Gunābādī Order--to take a modern example--acts in his name and even accepts pledges of allegiance on his behalf.¹⁷⁷

Sainthood, however, is not always confined to wise and serious people. Insane and lunatic men have also been occasionally accepted among their sacred ranks. These are the so-called attracted ones, (majdhūbān) whose bold utterances are sometimes considered to be inspired. Peculiar representatives of these people are the so-called wise fools (ḥuqalā-i majānīn, shūrīdagān), to whom Ḥaṭṭār has devoted a number of his poetical stories. Contrary to Jewish tradition, which considered the "fool" impious or wicked,¹⁷⁸ the Muslims regarded them as people who were excused and freed from religious and social duties. Their insanity was sometimes recognized by the Sufis as a divine madness (junūn-i il-āhī). They were regarded by some Sufi thinkers as being partly or completely conquered by the "unseen."¹⁷⁹ A prototype of these holy fools was the well-known Buhlūl (d. ca. 814 A.D.), whom legend has made a cousin of the Caliph Harūn al-Rashīd (d. 809 A.D.). Although stories about him have been partly confused with those of Ulayyan, Anbawa, Taq al-Baṣāl and other notorious fools,¹⁸⁰ he undoubtedly had Shi'ite tendencies, and had addressed remonstrances to the Caliph Harūn. A number of his stories are recorded in Sufi literature, and have thoughtful features. He is said to have been a contemporary of Fuḍayl.

Another representative of these wise fools is the martyr Sarmad (d. 1661-2), known for his exquisite quatrains and his tragic death. Converted to Islam, this Jew of Kashan travelled to India and embraced Sufism. It was there that he became a fakir, lost his control and went about naked. His unconsciousness was such that he used to utter unorthodox words and to pronounce only the negative part of the Muslim faith, claiming that he had not passed the stage of negation to reach the state of affirmation. Such daring utterance was sufficient to draw public wrath against him. Having been admired by the Prince Dārā Shukūh, he later was arrested and put to death as a heretic--just after the fall of that ill-starred Prince.

These wise-fool saints, as represented by Buhlūl, Luqmān-i Sarakhsī¹⁸¹ and Sarmad, remind us in several respects of the Syriac Šātē ascetics for whom the best way to follow the Christ was to act like a fool in order to be exposed to the public Šitutā (contempt). Thus the Šātē ascetics are to be considered as a Christian precursor of both "the people of blame" and the wise fools of Islam.¹⁸² Nevertheless, they were probably not regarded with the same compassionate eyes as their Muslim counterparts were later regarded in Muslim countries.

These wise fools of Islam are also depicted in the poetical works of Ḥaṭṭār, who has no less than 115 stories concerning their deeds and words in the course of his Mathnawīyāt.¹⁸³ They express their bold and daring opinions concerning the godhead, creation, and especially the distribution of fortune and good, in ways that are pessimistic, harsh, and sometimes cynical. Their critical stand toward God and creation reminds us of the heretic Ibn al-Rāwandī. A well-known qitḥ^C of Ḥayy al-Qudāt attributed also with some additions to Nāṣir Khusraw,¹⁸⁴ may be considered as a list of the objections frequently raised by these wise fools of Ḥaṭṭār against the godhead.

VIII

The atmosphere in which the Sufi thinker used to live was haunted by the overwhelming idea of God. The "Infinite" had enchanted him and he could do nothing but concentrate on it, submit to it, and enjoy it. When awake his heart was preoccupied with this idea, and when asleep his dreams were filled with divine

visions. When he tended his heart, he found that it was the favorite throne of God; and whenever he neglected it, even for a short moment, he would feel that it has fallen prey to the devil's attempts to lure it away (waswās, waswasah). When speaking to other men, his speech was in one way or another connected with God; when silent his thoughts were directed to the same idea.

His best moments were mostly spent in his dhikr, the regular ritual glorifying Allah with certain fixed phrases repeated in a definite order, either aloud (dhikr-i jalī) or whispered (dhikr-i khafī), often with peculiar breathing and physical movements. When he gave in to earthly pleasure, he would hear the bodiless voice of the heavenly herald (hātif) rebuking him. This auditory hallucination, which reminds us of the Zoroastrian srush and the Socratic daimon, would lead him back to his fixed idea.

This fixed idea pursued him, tortured him and sometimes reduced him to sacred delirium. Although he was kind, quiet, and wise in his general comportment, his behavior manifested certain pathological signs when observed by the layman. His involvement in the divine affair absorbed nearly all of his time and attention. Every time Abū Ḥamzah-i Sufi (d. 902 A.D.) heard the wind whistling, the water murmuring or the cock crowing he used to say: "Yes, here I am," as if in everything he heard a divine call.¹⁸⁵ Long before his persecution, Ḥallāj used to go to the market places of Baghdad and shout helplessly: "O folk, help me to get rid of the One [God] who does not leave me to myself to enjoy, nor does he take me away from myself so that I may live in peace."¹⁸⁶

Such an internal condition did not permit the Sufi to experience anything but God in all of his external environment. To him God was the absolute reality, the creative truth (ḥaqq), compared to which everything else seemed to be unreal, vain and of a shadowy existence.¹⁸⁷ With such a concept of God, he naturally was not inclined to seek logical proof of God's existence. A well-known tradition that the Prophet had urged Muslims to think of the mercies of God rather than His existence, would suffice to keep him away from metaphysical speculations.¹⁸⁸ What can one gain from all such useless speculations? How should the gnat know--asked Jalāl al-Dīn Mawlawī ingeniously--of how old the garden is? The poor creature, continues the poet, has just been born in the spring and will see its death the following winter.¹⁸⁹ If the miserable worm, born inside the timber can know the wood when it was a young tree, then the philosopher may also know the beginning of the world.

As a follower of revelation the Sufi disliked the Hellenistic philosophy introduced in the Muslim world by Mu^ctazilite theologians, but as a preacher of the divine path he could rethink its problems within the limits of revelation. The presence of God in the universe is, of course, as evident as the brightness of the sun, as impossible to overlook as the fact of man's own existence. Concerning this problem, however, a number of speculative proofs were to be found in every formal credo of orthodox Islam.¹⁹⁰ Theologians and philosophers have presented their well-known arguments on novitate mundi (hudūth-i ʿālam), or on contingentia mundi (imkān-i ʿālam), but all these skillful arguments have sought in the imperfect a reason for the perfect, in the unreal a witness to the real. But a mystic cannot share such reasoning. If there is something whose existence needs to be demonstrated, it is by no means the perfect being; it is rather the unreal being of the world. The philosopher who proves the existence of the necessary by means of the contingent is like the foolish man who seeks, to use the word of Shabīṣṭarī, the blazing sun by the dim light of a torch in the desert.¹⁹¹ A critical remark made by Shams-i Tabrīzī (d. ca. 1247) in this connection represents the Sufi stand on such problems. We read in Fīh mā Fīh that Shams was present one day in a meeting where an arrogant scholar claimed to have convincing proof for the existence of God. The following day Shams proclaimed ironically before the same audience that he had seen the angels come down to earth the night before to thank the scholar for proving the existence of their God. Then Shams reproached the arrogant philosopher in his sarcastic way:

If there is anyone who requires a reason for his being, it is not the Creator of all things, it is the poor creature whose being depends on the will and providence of his Creator.¹⁹²

When al-Ghazzālī and Mawlawī accused the philosophers of disbelief, there was no doubt in their minds that Greek philosophy was a direct threat to the true faith. But they didn't have the courage--or, more accurately, the capacity--to eliminate their own interest in speculation that was so clearly reflected and developed in their exposition of the Sufi path. This explains why they remained somewhat rationalistic even in their declared anti-rationalism.

Moreover, some earlier Sufis like Ḥakīm-i Tirmidhī, al-Junayd and Ḥallāj also had philosophical tendencies, just as some philosophers like al-Fārābī, Avicenna, and Shaykh-i Ishrāq did not lack mystical inclinations. It is for this reason then that Avicenna

speaks so highly of the mystics,¹⁹³ and that Shaykh-i Ishrāq assures us that Aristotle himself--appearing in the Shaykh's illuminative vision--had declared people like Bayazīd and Sahl-i Tustarī to be the real philosophers who had not stopped on the edge of formal sciences but had reached intuitive and contemplative knowledge.¹⁹⁴

The common point at which the mystic and the philosophers usually met was the metaphysical region, the realm of the unseen, their common concern being knowledge, the soul and God. Nevertheless, unlike the philosophers who sought to know God only through His own existence, the mystics' guide to this knowledge was His undeniable Omnipresence. This kind of proof was hence called sid-dīqīn, a Qur'anic appellation the Sufis used to employ.¹⁹⁵

The true knowledge that lies beyond the reach of reason is accessible only to the heart, which is a window onto the realm of the "unseen." It is through this inner light that the Sufi can explore the hidden realm, which is closed to reason. The philosopher who tries to force his way through this closed region is like a man who sees a shadow and deduces that the shadow belongs to a person but is unable to judge what that person is like. Only the inner light can penetrate into the forbidden area and recognize the person to whom the shadow may belong.¹⁹⁶ This knowledge of the "unseen," denied to mortals and belonging only to God,¹⁹⁷ is occasionally granted to the saints, through his inner light, from God's side. It is therefore called ʿilm-i ladunni, "knowledge from the side of God."

Thus, the world of the unseen, forbidden to both the external senses and speculative reason is, nevertheless, an object of Islamic faith,¹⁹⁸ and no Muslim is allowed to doubt its existence. Whereas the external world, open both to sense and reason, is also called the world of creation (ʿālam-i khalq) and the world of sovereignty (ʿālam-i mulk), the unseen world is styled the "world of command" (ʿālam-i amr) and the invisible world (ʿālam-i ghayb). This hidden realm includes the world of divine authority (ʿālam-i malakūt), the world of divine power (ʿālam-i jabarūt) and the world of divine being (ʿālam-i lahūt). Even though there existed some ambiguity concerning the relation among these three worlds, there was no doubt, however, about their existence.

To the Sufi's mind, the perceptible world has no real existence so that, compared to the "unseen world," it is but a mere shadow. Therefore everything that belongs to the perceptible world is

considered as an illusory veil for the Sufi traveller whose ultimate goal is to attain the one reality beyond the shadowy world. With such a spiritualist cosmology, the present world is of little value to the Sufi, not even worth "the wing of a midge," to use the usual Sufi expression. Nevertheless in his happy instants, he may find this same vain world an emanation of God. Hence his lack of pessimism. Through his mystical experiences he finds, moreover, the only truth, the "One" compared to whose existence all other beings have only a shadowy existence. Here we find the mystic Ibn al-^CArabi one pace from what may be called pantheism. What Ibn al-^CArabi meant by His "unity of being" (wahdat al-wujūd) is not really very clear, and the ambiguous way in which he has explained his ideas has invited confusion and misunderstanding. His unity of being, in any case, seems to be closer to panentheism rather than mere pantheism. One may call it a monism very far from both pan-cosmism and acosmism.

Even if Ibn al-^CArabi taught what may be called a pure pantheism, his teaching did not fail to encounter obstinate opponents even among his fellow Sufis.¹⁹⁹ And his teaching did not become acceptable to orthodox Sufis until Sufi scholars like Ṣadr al-Dīn and Qaysarī in Turkey, ^CAbd al-Razzāq and Jāmī in Persia and Transoxania brought it within the established Sufi kind of panentheism already familiar to early Sufis.

A well-known reinterpretation offered by the Indian mystic Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī (d. 1624) suggests it to be an experimental unity (wahdat al-shuhūd), of psychological rather than ontological nature, in the course of which the gnostic "sees" nothing but God. Nevertheless, when he turns to his normal state, he finds that his experience is but a subjective realization and that the "being" is by no means to be confused with the "non-being."²⁰⁰ A faint reflection of what the Ḥallājites have called "the unity of witness" may be seen in this new interpretation. The Ḥallājites explained that the union with God was experienced by al-Ḥallāj. It was, however, achieved in God's bearing witness to his own unity in the mystic's heart.

The divinity (lāhūt), however, even though fully manifested in humanity (nāsūt),²⁰¹ remains transcendental in its unity, and the gulf separating the being and the non-being remains unbridged. As a matter of fact, even in his mystical moments, the human soul is veiled from the godhead by its very essence, its "I-ness" (annīyah) which keeps it away from the divinity.²⁰² Nevertheless, these happy moments do provide rare opportunities to enjoy the beatific vision.

The sincere crossing of the mystic through an innumerable series of "veils" separating him from his "sublime goal" is what the Sufis call the spiritual ascension (mi^cra^j). In addition to writing on the nocturnal ascension of the Prophet, which was by far the most sublime type of ascension, the Sufis also reported on their own spiritual ascensions. Whether the Prophet's ascension did or did not inspire Dante's Divine Comedy does not concern us here, but on the Sufi ascension reports, that of Bayazīd left a visible mark.

Numerous records have been preserved of this heavenly journey, including some even with esoteric interpretations. In one account he is reportedly to have pitched his tent opposite God's throne. In another passage, finding himself at the very throne of God, he asks in a friendly fashion: "O throne, they tell us that God rests upon thee," and the throne answers: "O Bāyazīd, we are told that He dwells in a humble heart." In another passage he makes use of the well-known mystical symbols of a bird and its wings to narrate his spiritual adventure. "I became a bird with a body of oneness and wings of everlastingness." The fact that the "spiritual bird" flew further on, crossed the "field of eternity," and reached the "tree of oneness," only to find at the end that "all this was a fraud,"²⁰³ denotes that the mystic can never succeed in crossing the impossible gulf separating him from the godhead. One may recall Ḥaṭṭār's "thirty birds," which, even though they found themselves to be essentially one with the Sīmurgh, could not penetrate the curtain where the godhead remained, beyond their reach. Hence the sceptical tone occasionally expressed in Sufi poetry, describing gnosis to be an illusion, and even love to be a deception.

In view of such a desperate prospect, what hope remains for a real mystical union? When Ḥāfīz assures us that the "love" is not really as easy a task as it first appears, he is explaining this tragic aspect of Sufi love.²⁰⁴ Even if the mystical union could be attained for a perfect man, its expression would not be easily achievable, given the limited possibilities of ordinary words.

Sa^cdī tells us in a brilliant passage of a mystic who once bowed his head in holy meditation and was plunged deep in the sea of divine contemplation. When he came back to himself, one of his companions asked him, "What gift did you bring us from the garden you have been enjoying?" He answered, not without desperation: "First, I had the intention of filling my skirt with roses for

friends, but when I reached there the flowers' perfume so ravished me that my skirt slipped from my hand."²⁰⁵

A strikingly similar account was given by Ibn al-^CArabī, who describes in a less poetical way the same desperate attitude of the mystic. "A diver who was endeavoring to bring to the shore the red jacinth of deity hidden in its resplendent shell, emerged from that ocean empty-handed with broken arms, blind, dumb, and dazed..." When he was asked "What has disturbed thee and what has happened," he answered with almost the same sceptical tone of Sa^Cdī, "Far is that which you seek.... None ever attained to God and neither spirit nor body conceived the knowledge of him."²⁰⁶

This desperate attitude, however, does not prevent the mystic from having his rare moments of Supreme Delight. These moments are filled with the experience of dissolution of one's individual conscience into an alleged cosmic one. Such an unusual experience brings about the pleasant hallucination of having joined the cosmic conscience. It is in the latter that the mystic recognizes the so-called universal truth--whence his claim to utmost certainty.

This mystical certainty--a characteristic of Sufi thought--denotes firm faith in the "unseen" and in the life hereafter. It requires the believer to be so sure of the existence of the unseen that according to an oft-quoted expression, ascribed by some writers to Amīr Ibn ^CAbd-i Qays and by others to Ali b. Abī Ṭālib,²⁰⁷ even if the veils which separate the perceptible world from the "unseen" were lifted, the Sufi's certainty would not be increased.

This explains why the fear of death, of fate, and of men so abundantly found in pre-Islamic minds is not to be seen in Sufi literature.²⁰⁸ When no real existence, but only a shadowy one, is ascribed to the whole perceptible world, what then remains to inspire fear in the Sufi's heart? We read in Asrār al-Tawhīd that once Abū Bakr-i Wasiṭī said to his disciples that

The sun is shining through the window and motes of dust have appeared. Then the wind blows in and the motes begin to move in the sunlight. Can all this inspire in you any fear? In the eyes of the believer, that is, the true Sufi, [continued the holy man] the whole of the perceptible world is naught but that worthless dust moved by the wind.²⁰⁹

Three degrees of certainty are mentioned in the Qur'an of which there are many different Sufi interpretations indeed.²¹⁰ They consist of the knowledge of certainty (ʿilm al-yaqīn), the intuition of certainty (ḥayn al-yaqīn), and the realization of certainty (ḥaqq al-yaqīn), of which the first concept represents knowledge, the second sight, and the third reality.

Thus, whereas the knowledge of certainty denotes the firm belief in what the revelation has urged as the object of creed, the intuition of certainty describes the mystical contemplation with which the Sufi intuitively perceives the object of the belief, and the realization of certainty refers to the state in which the Sufi experiences the actual happening of what he had intuitively perceived before.

These different degrees of certainty coincide also with the different aspects of religious life as conceived by the Sufis. The knowledge of certainty belonging to the common (ʿāmmah) conforms to the religious law (sharīʿah), the intuition of certainty, which belongs to the elect (khass), coincides with the mystical path (ṭarīqah), and the realization of certainty, which belongs to the super-elect (khass al-khass), coincides with the mystical truth (ḥaqīqah). In other words, while the knowledge of certainty requires the purification of the body, the intuition of certainty is based on the purification of the heart, and the realization of certainty demands the purification of the soul.²¹¹ The mystical experience styled the "unity of witness," which Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī proposed against the so-called unity of being of Ibn al-ʿArabī belongs also to the concept of the intuition of certainty just mentioned above.²¹²

Whereas the orthodox theologians held that there is no distinction between the "law" and the "truth," so that they did not recognize in Muslim religious life any special title for the "path," the extremist Sufis claimed that the "law" itself was nothing but a way to the "truth," and, once the "truth" is attained, the "law" is eliminated. The orthodox Sufis, however, maintained that the "law" is a guiding light without which the traveller cannot find his way along the path, and so every deviation from the "law" is also a deviation from the "path."²¹³ This explains why Shaykh-i Jām argued for his so-called authoritative license (maqām-i mubaḥ bi-ḥujjat), according to which the Sufi can do only that for which he is able to find an authoritative justification.²¹⁴

To the question of whether religious observance (taklīf) prescribed by the "law" may or may not be eliminated for the mystic

who has attained the truth, the famous Shaykh-i Kubrā answers "yes" because for such people the religious observance is in no way a painful obligation (mashaqqah, taklīf shāqq);²¹⁵ in fact, it is a delight rather than a tiresome task. This sagacious shaykh remarks elsewhere that, in the spiritual quest undertaken by the Sufis, the "law" is like the vessel, the "path" like the sea, and the "truth" like the pearl.²¹⁶ Thus, anyone who desires to gain the pearl has to embark on the vessel and to sail the sea.

Despite the great weight the Sufis put on religious observances, they did not preach any discrimination in matters of religion. For Jalāl al-Dīn Mawlawī religious quarrels, which at that time took such horrible shape as in the Crusades, were judged to be based on essentially mere verbal disputes. Long before him, al-Hallāj taught that Judaism, Christianity, Islam and even other creeds were only different appellations of one and the same truth.²¹⁷ This view was shared by many Sufi thinkers. ^CAyn al-Qudāt remarks, for instance, that if a Muslim could see in Christ what the Christians see in him, he would inevitably be a Christian.²¹⁸ And Shabistarī tells us with much more emphasis that if the Muslim knew what faith meant, he would see that real faith is idol-worship, and that if the idol-worshipper knew what the idol was, how would his faith be misplaced?²¹⁹

Thus, not only did they advocate the ultimate unity of religions, but they also thought, with Hallāj,²²⁰ that religions are imposed by God on men rather than chosen by men themselves. No one is to be reproached for his religion, and therefore the concept of the unity of religions was enthusiastically taught by the Sufi shaykhs.

Even the Hindu thinkers Kabir (d. 1518) and Nānak (d. 1539), who preached the "unity of religions" in a country where religious differences had produced unnumberable troubles, really found their true inspirers in the Muslim Sufis. The idea of the unity of religions did not succeed, of course, in producing religious peace in India but made of the Hindu poet, the mystic Kabir, a holy man. After his death Hindus and Muslims contended for his body and disputed whether it should be buried or burned.²²¹ The new Sikh religion founded by Nānak, though based on this tolerant concept, failed on several occasions to end disputes between Muslims and Hindus.

A stronger version of this idea, however, was the religious policy of the Mongol Emperor Akbar (d. 1605), who thought that every person according to his condition may give the Supreme Being

a different name, and urged that religious disputes cease. This high ideal was not best realized in his Divine Religion (Dīn-i Ilāhī), which he founded as a new faith, but in the person and the teaching of his great-great-grandson, the Prince Dārā Shukūh, whose personal attempts to realized this idea cost him his life.

EPILOGUE

There is every reason to believe that Sufism has gradually lost its significance as an intellectual force in modern Persia. Tired of persecution, vexed by contempt, and split by sectarian strife, it has finally succumbed to the pressures of circumstances. Respectable shaykhs of past generations, such as Ṣafī Ali Shāh (d. 1899) and Ḥaj Mullā Sulṭān Gunābādī (d. 1934), have passed away, leaving behind nothing but quarrels and chaos. Mendicant dervishes of the Jalālī and Khāksarī types have come to represent almost the only remnants of the wandering dervishes, and they are regarded as idle beggars in popular eyes.

Although certain groups of Ni^cmatullāhīs and Dhahābīs are still strong enough to absorb even elements of higher society into their ranks, the mystical mood no longer plays any major role in their actual life. Polemical writings concerning their pretensions to succession to the dead shaykhs have also discredited the living ones in popular esteem. Kayvān-i Qazvīnī (d. 1938), a renegade of the Gunābadīs, accused the shaykhs who were his contemporaries of rapacious and ambitious intentions. Some of his books, especially Kitāb-i Ustuvār, Kitāb-i Rāz-Gushā, and Kayvān-Nāmah, have caused irreparable damage to the prestige of Sufi shaykhs.

Needless to say, the fanatical ulama at the present time criticize Sufism as severely as the ulama of Qajar and Safavid times did. A mordant pamphlet, for instance, written by a religious writer of Qum, has raised heretical accusations against such poets as Ḥāfiz and Rūmī.²²²

Kasravī (d. 1946), a modern Persian historian and religious reformist, regarded the Sufi teachings as an opiate which Western imperialism has infused into the East to prevent its awakening. He insisted that, even, in the past, the teachings of Ḥāfiz, Sa^cdi, and Rūmī had only encouraged ignorance and idleness among their admirers. Kasravī's pamphlet²²³ has been regarded by many as a bill of indictment against Sufism.

The so-called progressive groups, also, frown upon Sufism. The Marxists, for instance, regard Sufism as a weapon used by the reactionary classes against the anti-capitalist struggle of the proletariat. A well-known essay by Ahmād Qazī (= T. Erānī, d. 1940) on mysticism,²²⁴ although based on a very incomplete knowledge of the subject, represents an example of the critical attitude that Persian materialists have adopted regarding Sufism.

From the philosophical standpoint, logical objections, though not always of a coherent and profound nature, have been raised against the Sufi epistemology. A dilettante lawyer, to mention just one example, who has recently published a book against Sufi philosophy,²²⁵ points out that the intuitive knowledge on which Sufism is based can be but a mere illusion. He has maintained that the pantheistic theory of the Sufis is a hasty and superficial interpretation of existence derived chiefly from the ancients' erroneous conceptions of the world.

Even the very few scholars who now work on critical editions of classical Sufi texts treat these texts as sources for philological analysis, rather than as sources of mystical lore. This kind of approach is to be seen very clearly in the notes, remarks, and prefaces in their editions of Sufi texts.

While we must not expect to find suitable successors to Ghazzālī and Rūmī in such a secular time as ours, the contemporary literature of Sufism, it should be noted, displays nothing of that freshness which characterized the Sufi creations of classical times. It is true that a pessimistic melancholy, so frequently experienced in modern poetry, reveals a certain resemblance to the work of some Sufi poets of the past, but Sufism is no longer able to hold its position even on the edges of modern society.

NOTES

1. The text of this inscription has been rendered into English by M. Sprengling, Third Century Iran: Sapor and Kartir (Chicago, 1953). See also J. de Menasce, Skand Gumānik Vičar: La solution décisive des doutes, text et traduction (Université de Fribourg en Suisse, 1945), pp. 242-43.
2. H.H. Schaeder, "Der Manichaismus und sein Weg nach Osten, Glaube und Geschichte," in Festschrift für Friedrich Grogarten (Giessen, 1948), p. 248.
3. W. Radloff, Aus Sibirien, Vol. II (Leipzig, 1893), pp. 20 ff. Further information on Siberian Shamanism may be found in A. Friedrich and G. Budruss, Schamanengeschichten aus Sibirien (München, 1955) and H.N. Michael, Studies in Siberian Shamanism (Toronto, 1963). Although as a religion, Shamanism almost ceased to exist, remnants of its rites and practices are still recognizable in popular magic and folk tales of India and Central Asia.
4. V.G. Büchner, "Shaman," in Encyclopedia of Islam, Vol. 4, pp. 302-03, finds no connection between the Persian Shaman and the idea of the sorcerer-priest among the Northeast Asian peoples, but the descriptions of shamanism in Persian poetry leave no doubt for me that they are identical. Persian poets like Rūdakī may have learned about such sorcerer-priests from Tungus slaves in the court of Bukhara.
5. H.S. Nyberg, Die Religionen des Alten Iran (Leipzig, 1938).
6. W. Henning, Zoroaster, Politician or Witch-doctor? (Oxford, 1951).
7. The dualism of Zoroaster is perhaps best understood, as Henning has pointed out in Zoroaster, Politician or Witch-doctor?, as a protest against monotheism. For a further discussion of this problem, see J. Duchesne-Guillemin, The Western Response to Zoroaster (Oxford, 1958).
8. R.C. Zaehner, The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism (London and New York, 1961), p. 275.
9. Ibid., p. 306.

10. Mani was born in South Babylonia in 216 A.D. He preached actively throughout the Persian empire until the Sasanian Great King Bahrām I had him fettered and thrown into prison early in 276 A.D. According to Manichaeism sources, Mani died there within a month of his imprisonment. For a detailed account of his life and beliefs see G. Widengren, Mani and Manichaeism (London and New York, 1965).
11. H.C. Puech, Le Manichaeisme (Paris, 1948), p. 70.
12. H.C. Puech, "The Concept of Redemption in Manichaeism," Papers from the Eranos Yearbook, Vol. VI, pp. 249-50.
13. M. Boyce, The Manichaean Hymn-Cycles in Parthian (Oxford, 1954).
14. E. Herzfeld, Paikuli, Monument and Inscription of the Early History of the Sassanian Empire, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1924), p. 43. See also Menasce, op. cit., p. 243, note 2.
15. W. Barthold, "Der Iranische Buddhismus und sein Verhältnis zum Islam," in Oriental Studies in Honour of Cursetji Erachji Pavry, ed. by Jal Dastur Cursetji Pavry (London, 1933), p. 29.
16. Narshakhī, The History of Bukhara, trans. by R.N. Frye (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 20.
17. Muhammad al-Shahrastānī, Book of Religious and Philosophical Sects, Cureton edition (London, 1846), p. 418.
18. In Islam, this method of interpretation was largely used by Shi'ites, the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā, philosophers, and Sufis who wished to bring Qur'anic revelation into agreement with their own tenets.
19. I. Goldziher, Die Richtungen der Islamischen Koranslegung (Leiden, 1902), p. 210.
20. Zaehner, op. cit., p. 196.
21. R.A. Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism (Cambridge, 1921), p. 133.
22. L. Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique de la mystique musulmane (Paris, 1922), pp. 117-20.
23. This was the so-called inclusive devotion of faith to God--ikhhlāṣ al-dīnī li-allāh. See the Qur'an, 4:146, 7:29, 10:22, 21:65, 39:11, 14:40, 12:65.
24. See for example E.W. Lane, Manners and Customs of Modern Egyptians (London, 1895), p. 98.
25. Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, vol. II, ed. by Aḥmad Shākir (Cairo, 1948-present), p. 460. See also al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, ed. by L. Krehl and T. Juynboll (Leiden, 1862-1908), bāb 39.
26. H.A.R. Gibb, Mohammedanism (Oxford, 1949), p. 40.
27. Massignon, op. cit., p. 124. See also M.M. Khwānsārī, Rawḍāt al-Jinnāt fi ahwāl al-ʿulamā' wa al-Sādāt, Vol. II (Tehran, 1287), p. 232.

28. Massignon, op. cit., p. 124, note 4, where he makes mention of, among others, Abū Bakr al-Makhzūmī (d. ca. 94 A.H.) who was called "rāhib of the Quraysh." Murdar, a Muṭtazilite teacher, was also called, and not in a pejorative sense, the "rāhib of Kufah."
29. This was in particular the position of Muhammad b. Kar-rām, a Jurjī'ite of the early Abbasid period whose views manifest some Sufi features. Cf. H. Laoust, Les schismes dans l'Islam (Paris, 1965), pp. 121-22.
30. Ibid., p. 29-30.
31. Cf. I. Goldziher, Muhammad and Islam (New Haven, 1917), pp. 99-100.
32. He is said to have denied the mercifulness of God--as an attribute resembling human attributes--and in so doing he may be considered similar to the so-called wise fool mystics of Islam. He is reported (see H. Ritter, Muslim Mystics' Strife with God, "Oriens Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-15) to have taken his disciples to visit lepers and other sufferers. He would then say, pointing to these people, "This was all done by the Most Merciful of Mercifuls." Was this converted Persian still under the influence of his former creed, which attributed all these kinds of evils to the Devil? He is reputed to have been killed under suspicion of heresy.
33. Cf. H. Ritter, Der Islam Vol. XXI, pp. 1-83.
34. Laoust, op. cit., pp. 48-49.
35. Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, Mathnawī, Book IV, ed. and trans. by R.A. Nicholson, Gibb Memorial Series, New Series, IV (London, 1929), lines 1515-1519.
36. Ibn al-Nadīm, Kitāb al-Fihrist, ed. by Flügel (Leipzig, 1871-2), p. 358.
37. Ibn al-Qifṭī, Tārīkh al-Ḥukamā', ed. by J. Lippert (1903), p. 183.
38. Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. ʿUthmān Hujwīrī, Kashf al-Maḥjūb trans and ed. by R.A. Nicholson, 2nd ed., Gibb Memorial Series, Vol. XVII (London, 1967), p. 47.
39. Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, Muslim Saints and Mystics (Tadhkirat al-Awliyā') trans by A.J. Arberry (Chicago, 1966).
40. Hujwīrī, op. cit., p. 106.
41. Ibid., p. 163.
42. S. de Laugier de Beaurecueil, Khawādja ʿAbdullāh Anṣārī (Beirut, 1965), p. 66.
43. Hujwīrī, op. cit., p. 163.
44. B. Furuzānfar, ed., Tarjumah-i Risālah-i Qushayriyah (Tehran, 1345), pp. 129-130, casts doubt on this point.
45. The recent work by J. Spencer Trimingham, The Sufi Orders in Islam (Oxford, 1971) reached me too late for inclusion here.

- However, I refer interested students to it, and in particular to Professor Trimingham's comprehensive glossary of Sufi and Islamic terminology. Concerning the Shi'ite orders of Iran see: R. Grāmlich, Die Schiitischen Derwischorden Persiens (Wiesbaden, 1965).
46. A.J. Arberry, "Sufism," Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abt. I: VIII Band: 2 abs. (Leiden and Köln, 1961), p. 465.
 47. Gulistān, Chapter 2, Story 25.
 48. For an English translation of his views on Sufism, see "The Science of Sufism," The Muqaddima, Vol. 3, trans by F. Rosenthal (New York, 1958), pp. 76-102.
 49. Algazel: Dogmática, moral y ascética (Saragossa, 1901), p. 101.
 50. Ibid., p. 104.
 51. A.J. Arberry, "The Biography of Shaikh Abū Ishāq al-Kāzarūnī," Oriens, Vol. III (1950), pp. 163-182.
 52. A. Bausani, "Religion under the Mongols," Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. 5 (Cambridge, 1968), p. 547.
 53. For a more detailed discussion concerning the Shi'ite development in Persian Sufism, see M. Molé, "Les Kurbrawiya entre Sunnisme et Shiisme," Revue des Etudes Islamiques (1961), pp. 61-142.
 54. F.C. Schillinger, ed. Persianische und Ost-Indianische Reiseschreibung (Hamburg, 1710), p. 685.
 55. Maṣṣūm Alī b. Raḥmat ḌAlī Niḍmat-Allāhī al-Shīrāzī (Maṣṣūm Alishah), Tarā'iq al-Ḥaqā'iq, 2nd ed., ed. by M. Maḥjub (Tehran, 1339), p. 354.
 56. Jāmī dedicated his Tuḥfat al-Aḥrār to Khwājah-i Aḥrār.
 57. H.A. Rose, The Dervishes (London, 1927), p. 87; this is a new edition of J.P. Brown's The Dervishes (Istanbul, 1868).
 58. For a detailed account of these events see Sir John Malcolm, The History of Persia, Vol. II (London, 1815), pp. 417-422.
 59. Rūmī, op. cit., Vol. I, line 1727.
 60. Hujwīrī, op. cit., pp. 308-309.
 61. ḌIrāqī, The Song of Lovers (ḌUshshāq-nāmah), ed. and trans. by A.J. Arberry, (London, 1939), pp. 33-39.
 62. Philo Judaeus, On a Contemplative Life, in Works trans. by C.D. Youge (London, 1855), Vol. 4, p. 3.
 63. For further details, see H. Lewy, Sobria Ebrietas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1929).
 64. A.J. Arberry, The Mystical Poems of Ibn al-Fārid, pp. 81-90.
 65. Shaykh Maḥmūd Shabastarī, Sharḥ-i Gulshan-i Rāz, ed. by E.H. Whinfield (London, 1880), pp. 42, 27, 29.

66. E.G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia (Cambridge, 1928), Vol. IV, p. 297. Pp. 284-297 contain both the complete text of Hātif's Tarjī^C-band and Browne's translation of it.
67. Khwājah Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā'īl b. Muḥammad Mustamlī Bukhārī, Sharḥ wa Tarjumah al-Taḥrīf Limadhhab al-Taṣawwūf (Lucknow, 1933, 4 vols.
68. Muḥammad b. al-Munawwar, Asrār al-Tawḥīd fī Maqāmāt al-Shaykh Abi Sa'īd (Tehran, 1934-5).
69. Maqāmāt-i Zandapīl (Aḥmad-i Čām); Persian text from 4th cent. A.H. by Sadīd al-Dīn Muḥammad Gaznavī, ed. by H. Moayyed, 1961.
70. Numerous editions, most recent (Tehran, 1340).
71. Abū Bakr Muḥammad, known as Ibn al-^CArabī, Al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyah, 2nd ed., Vol. II (Cairo, 1293), p. 275.
72. For cases see Ibn al-Mubārak, Kitāb al-Zuhd (Indian edition, 1966), pp. 4-5.
73. Qushayrī, op. cit., p. 158.
74. Hujwīrī, op. cit., p. 131.
75. Ibid., pp. 82-160.
76. Heinrich Heine, Die Stadt Lucca, Chap. IX. This prayer has also been voiced in Persian verse; see Sa'īdī, Būstān Chap. II; cf. the prayer of Suhrawardī, which has greater moral intensity than Rābī^Cah's.
77. For detailed descriptions of these rites, consult the article "Hadjdj" in Encyclopedia of Islam, Vol. II, 1st ed.
78. Hujwīrī, op. cit., p. 328.
79. For the case of Ḥiḍrīmī, see Najm al-Dīn Kubrā, Die Fawāih al-Jamāl wa Fawātiḥ al-Jalāl des Najm ad-Dīn Kubrā, ed. by F. Meier (Wiessenbaden, 1957).
80. For the Syriac text and English translation of this account, see E.W. Brooks, "John of Ephesus, Lives of the Eastern Saints III," Patrologia Orientalis, Vol. 19, pp. 164-79.
81. Abū ^CAbd al-Rahmān S lami, Risalat al-Malāmatīyah, ed. by Abū al-^CAlāh ^CAfīfī as Al-Malāmatīyah wa al-Sūfīyah wa Ahl al-Futuḥah (Cairo, 1945).
82. B. Furuzānfar, Sharḥ-i Mathnawī-i Sharīf (Tehran, 1347 A.H. Sol.), II, p. 735.
83. See the dialogue between this Nūḥ-i ^CAyyār and the Sufi Shaykh Ḥamdūn al-Qaṣṣār in Hujwīrī, op. cit., pp. 183-84, where the ^CAyyār takes what is very much a Malāmatī stand on the problem of gentlemanly behavior.
84. Ibid., p. 119.
85. Malcolm, op. cit., Vol.
86. See, for instance, Abū al-Ḥasan ^CAlī b. Zayd-i Bayhaqi, Tārīkh-i Bayhaq, ed. by A. Bahmanyar (Tehran, 1317); ^CIzz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan, known as Ibn al-Athīr, Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh, trans

by J.T. Reinaud and C.F. Defremery into French as Extrait de la... Kamel, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades...Historiens Orientaux, toms. I, 2, 4, 5 (Paris, 1872-); A.K.S. Lambton, Islamic Society in Persia (London, 1954).

87. Hujwiri, op. cit., p. 66, which gives a detailed explanation of this saying.

88. ^CAyn al-Qudāt al-Hamadānī, Zubdat al-Haqā'iq, Ch. 17.

89. See Rhys Davids, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 1911, pp. 200-01; cf. Abū Hayyān, Muqabasāt, p. 259, where the Arab thinker quotes this parable immediately following a reference to Plato.

90. ^CAyn al-Qudāt, op. cit., Ch. 61.

91. Ibn al-^CArabī, op. cit., I, p. 70.

92. See Mathnawī, II, line 159; cf. Hāfiẓ, Dīwān, ghazāl no. 162.

93. ^CAzīz al-Nasafī, Kashf al-Haqā'iq, Persian text ed. by A.M. Damghani (Tehran, 1965), p. 28.

94. See, for instance, 5:27, 2:97, 26:194.

95. 83:3.

96. Luke 16:15.

97. Gen. 6:6; cf. Ps. 32:11.

98. That the Hebrew leb (heart) was translated in later biblical writings alternately by the Greek words nous and kardia, to distinguish its rational and emotional aspects, was evidently a Hellenistic influence. To the average Semite, such distinctions remained unknown. For further details on the use of this concept in biblical writings, see Tresmontant, A Study of Hebrew Thought, pp. 83-124.

99. See, for instance, Les Pensées ed. by Brunshwicg, p. 459.

100. For more details on this esoteric interpretations, see Shaykh Najm al-Dīn Rāzī, Mirsad al-^CIbād (Tehran, 1312 A.H.Sol.) pp. 69.70; cf. ^CAyn al-Qudāt, Tamhīdāt, No. 342, where other interpretations are given as well.

101. Shabastari, op. cit., p. 4.

102. Qushayrī, op. cit., p. 134; cf. passages quoted by F. Meier, Die Fawā'ih, p. 170.

103. Kubrā-Meier, Die Fawā'ih, op. cit., Nos. 14, 139.

104. For a detailed illustration of such a comparison, see Abū Hāmid al-Ghazzālī, Mīzān al-^CAmal (Cairo, 1328), p. 109; cf. Margaret Smith, Al-Ghazzali, The Mystic (London, 1944), p. 73.

105. A divine tradition often quoted by Sufis is usually related to support the latter statement. See, for example, Abū Naṣr ^CAbdallāh b. ^CAlī al-Sarāj al-Tūsī, Al-Luma^C fī al-Taṣawwuf, ed. by R.A. Nicholson (Leiden, 1914), p. 594; and al-Ghazzālī, Ihya^CUlum al-Dīn (Cairo, 1272), 3:12.

106. See Ghazzālī, Ihya, op. cit., ʿAjā'ib al-Qalb, Bayan 10' cf. A.J. Wensinck, La Pensée de Ghazālī (Paris, 1940), pp. 122-125.
107. See, for instance, Kubrā, op. cit., No. 16.
108. Hujwīrī, op. cit., p. 369; cf. p. 367.
109. Ibid., p. 387.
110. Qushayrī, op. cit., p. 698.
111. See, for instance, Firdaws al-Murshidīyah, pp. 270, 474, 480, etc.
112. Rāzī, op. cit., pp. 160-65; and Shabastarī, op. cit., pp. 91, 96, 228, 368.
113. Upanishads IV, 3, 9-14.
114. See, for instance, A.J. Wensinck, "New Data Concerning Syriac Mystic Literature," p. 25.
115. Hujwīrī, p. 245; cf. Mathnawī, II, 830, 1347.
116. For an illustrative example see the story of Shaykh Abū Sā'id and Ḥasan Mu'addib in Asrar al-Tawhīd, op. cit., pp. 211-212.
117. See "Kitāb al-Sidq," IRA, 1937.
118. Hujwīrī, op. cit., pp. 190-05.
119. For further details on this point see Shabastarī, op. cit., p. 461.
120. Gulistan, Ch. I, Story 10.
121. Gulistan, Ch. 7.
122. Mathnawī, I, 983-85.
123. Cf. Miftāḥ al-Nijāt, pp. 146-49.
124. See O.D. Tcheschovitch, Bukharskyj dokumenti XIV veka (Tashkent, 1965).
125. Hujwīrī, op. cit., p. 247.
126. See, for instance, Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Nūrī's view in Sarrāj, op. cit., p. 272.
127. See Sarrāj, op. cit., p. 288, quoted by F. Meier, Vom Wesen der islamischen Mystik (Basel, 1943), pp. 19, 49.
128. Sarrāj, op. cit., pp. 296-97.
129. Qur'an, 18:65-78.
130. See, for instance, Mathnawī I, 3191: V, 1899; cf. also I, 224, 237.
131. Cf., for example, Firdōs al-murshidiyya: Die vita des Scheichs Aub Ishāq al-Kāzerūnī, ed. by F. Meier (Leipzig, 1948), pp. 340-41.
132. Muhammad b. Munawwar, Asrār al-Tawhīd, ed. by Z. Ṣafā (Tehran, 1332 A.H. Sol.), pp. 48, 93, 291.
133. Qur'an, 10:62.
134. See Tarā'iq al-Haqā'iq, op. cit., p. 1171; cf. Hujwīrī, op. cit., pp. 220-35; A.J. Wensinck, Muslim Creed, Its Genesis and

Historical Development (Cambridge, 1932), p. 226.

135. See Abū al-Mughīth al-Ḥusayn b. Maṣṣūr (al-Hallāj), Kitāb al-Tawāsīn, ed. by L. Massignon (Paris, 1913), pp. 172-73.

136. Mathnawī, I: 1246-7; cf. also index.

137. See Ibn al-ʿArabī, op. cit., I: 307; IV: 615.

138. Mathnawī, II: 2642-3.

139. Kitāb al-Tawāsīn, op. cit., IV: 24.

140. Ibid., pp. 20-22; cf. ʿAyn al-Qudāt, op. cit., No. 288.

141. See Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam fī Tārīkh al-Mulūk wa al-Umam (Haydarabad, 1359), Vol. 9, p. 261.

142. See ʿAyn al-Qudāt, op. cit., p. 283.

143. See R. Lescot, Enquête sur les yāsīdīs de Syrie et du Djebel Sinjar (Beirut, 1938), pp. 51 ff.

144. Cf. Mathnawī, II: 2645-9.

145. See Hujwīrī, op. cit., p. 213.

146. See Avicenna, Kitāb al-Ishārāt wa al-Tanlūhāt trans. into French by A.M. Goichon (Paris, 1951), pp. 503-06, 519-20.

147. Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., Quatremere ed., Arabic text I: 109, 199.

148. See "Kitāb Batanjāl al-Hindī," ed. by H. Ritter, Oriens 1956, Vol. IX, p. 199.

149. For further details, see D.S. Margoliouth, "Panj Pir," Encyclopedia of Islam.

150. See Muhammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī, Ṣalāt, bābs 48, 52, 54; Janāʿiz, bāb 62; and several others mentioned by Ibn Taymīyah, Contributions à une Etude de la Methodologie Canonique, trans. by H. Laoust (Cairo, 1939).

151. Firdōs al-Murshidiyya, op. cit., Ch. 40.

152. For illustrations see the accounts of travels and missions of Abū Ishāq Shīrāzī and Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī in various places in the Near East.

153. See Sarraj, op. cit., pp. 323-25.

154. See, for instance, Tirmidhī, Khatm al-Awliya', ed. by U. Yahya (Beirut, 1965), pp. 116-216.

155. Kubrā, op. cit., No. 167.

156. Lāhijī, Sharh-i Gulshan-i Rāz, ed. by K. Samīʿī (Tehran, 1337 A.H. Sol.) p. 441.

157. See Hujwīrī, op. cit., p. 213.

158. Ibid., p. 236; cf. ʿAzīz al-Nasafī, op. cit., p. 80.

159. Ibid.

160. Qurʾān, 18:64-82.

161. See Sarraj, op. cit., pp. 422-24.

162. Ibid., p. 423.

163. Hujwīrī, op. cit., pp. 236-37.

164. Sarraj, loc. cit.

165. See ʿAyn al-Qudāt, Zubdah, op. cit., Ch. 61; cf. Ch. 68.

166. Tirmidhī, op. cit., p. 361; cf. Ghazzālī, Ihya, op. cit., III: 25.
167. Tadhkirat al-Awliyā', op. cit., I, pp. 88-90.
168. Ibid., II, pp. 91-93.
169. Hujwīrī, op. cit., 153.
170. See Awrad al-Aḥbāb, II, pp. 339-40.
171. Dārā Shukūh, Safinah (Tehran, 1965), pp. 160-61.
172. W. Barthold, Turkistan down to the Mongol Invasion, tr. in Gibb Memorial Series, V., 2nd ed. (1928), pp. 75-176.
173. Concerning the possibility that his wife was perhaps the beneficiary of that privilege, see his autobiography, Kitāb Khatm, where she is supposed to receive a gem (nigīn = the seal) from God together with the knowledge of the "formers" and the "latters" (ulūm-i awwalīn wa akhirīn).
174. Cf. Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., III, p. 137.
175. See Nasafī, op. cit., p. 315.
176. See Lāhījī, op. cit., p. 315.
177. See Ḥaj Mullā Sulṭān, Wilayat-Nāmāh, pp. 23-25.
178. See, for instance, Deut. 32:21; Ps. 13:1, 52:2; cf. Job 30:8; Isa. 32:5, Sir. 50:28.
179. See Ibn al-ʿArabī, op. cit., I, Ch. 44.
180. See P. Loosen, Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, Vol. 27, 1912, pp. 196-201.
181. Cf. Asrār al-Tawhīd, op. cit., index.
182. M. Widengren, Orientalia Suecana, Vol. 2 (1953), pp. 41; cf. M. Mole, Les mystiques musulmans, (Paris, 1965), p. 12.
183. B. Furūzānfar, Sharḥ-i Ahwāl-i ʿAṭṭār, p. 68; cf. H. Ritter, Das Meer der Seele, Mensch Welt und Gott in Den Geschichten des Fariduddīn ʿAttār (Leiden, 1955), pp. 159-180.
184. See ʿAyn al-Quḍāt, Tamhīdāt, op. cit., p. 189; cf. Nāṣir Khusraw, Dīwān, p. 364.
185. Pages from Kitāb al-Lumaʿ of Abu Naṣr al-Sarrāj, ed. by A.J. Arberry (London, 1947), pp. 6-7. Cf. 26, 30.
186. Akhbar al-Hallāj, 3rd ed., No. 38; cf. 10, 36.
187. Qur'an 10:32; 20:114.
188. See Lāhījī, op. cit., p. 87.
189. See Mathnawī, II: 2321-2
190. For a concise survey of these theological proofs concerning the existence of God see A.J. Wensinck, "Les preuves de l'existence de Dieu dans la theologie musulmane," Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie (Amsterdam, 1936).
191. See Shastarī, op. cit., p. 87.
192. Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Mawlawī, Fī mā Fih, ed. by B. Furūzānfar (Tehran, 1330), p. 92.
193. Ibn Sīnā, Livre des directives et remarques, Nouveau groupe.
194. Shaykh-i Ishrāq, Opera Metaphysica et Mystica, ed. by H. Corbin (Istanbul, 1945), p. 74.

195. Ibn Sīnā, op. cit., pp. 371-72.
196. For more details on this comparison see Qaysarī's introduction in the commentary to the Ta'īyat al-Kubrā, quoted by Ḥuthmān Yahya, ed., in Khatm al-Awliya, op. cit., Appendix 492.
197. Qur'an, 10:20.
198. Ibid., 2:3.
199. See, for instance, correspondences between Ḥabd al-Razzāq-i Kāshānī and ḤAlā' al-Dawla-i Simnānī, in Ḥabd al-Rahmān Jāmī, Kitāb Nafahāt al-Uns, ed. by M. Tawhīdīpūr (Tehran, 1919).
200. For a further discussion of this theory see Burhān Aḥmad, The Mudjaddid's Concept of Tawhīd, (Lahore, 1940).
201. For al-Ḥallāj's remarks on this point, see Kitāb al-Tawāsīn, op. cit., pp. 129-141; cf. pp. 78, 198-199.
202. See Akhbār al-Ḥallāj, No. 50.
203. See Sarraj, op. cit., p. 384.
204. Dīwān, ghazal No. 1.
205. Gulistan, introductory chapter.
206. Ibn al-ḤArabī, Futūḥāt, op. cit., as quoted by Fleischer in Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts in the Leipzig University Library, p. 493.
207. See the discussion in Sarraj, op. cit., p. 70; and ḤAyn al-Qudāt, Tamhīdāt, op. cit., p. 98.
208. For a concise study of the pre-Islamic background of the Qur'anic concept of fear, see H. Ringgren, "Die Gottesfurcht im Koran," Orientalia Sueccana, Vol. III, pp. 2-4.
209. Munawwar, op. cit., p. 274.
210. Qur'an, 65:95; 69:51; 102:5, 7.
211. For further details on this point, consult Rāzī, op. cit., Ch. 3, 5, 7, 8.
212. Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī, Maktūbāt, No. 43.
213. Mathnawī, V, preface.
214. See, for details, Miftāḥ al-Nijāt, Ch. 5.
215. See Kubrā, op. cit., No. 39.
216. Risālat al-Sāfinah, quoted by F. Meier in Fawaih, op. cit., p. 282.
217. See Akhbār al-Ḥallāj, No. 45.
218. ḤAyn al-Qudāt, Tamhīdāt, op. cit., No. 370.
219. Shabastarī, op. cit., verses 872-73.
220. Akhbār al-Ḥallāj, op. cit.
221. Sir Charles Elliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. II (London, 1921), p. 265.
222. Sayyid Abul-Fazl BurqāḤī Qūmī, Al-Taftīsh dar Maslak-i Ṣufī va Darvīsh (1377 A.H.)
223. S.A. Kasravī, Ṣufīfarī (Tehran, 1332)
224. A. Qāzī (= T. Erānī), Irfān va Uṣūl-i Māddī (Tehran, 1323).
225. M. Javān, Kitāb-i Radd-i Taṣavvuf va Hikmat al-Isḥrāq (Tehran, 1347).

Iranian Studies is published quarterly by The Society for Iranian Studies. It is distributed to members of the Society as part of their membership. The annual subscription rate for non-members is \$5.00; the price of single copies is \$1.25 per issue. For institutions the subscription rate is \$8.00 per annum. The opinions expressed by the contributors are of the individual authors and not necessarily those of the Society or the editors of Iranian Studies. Articles for publication and all other communications should be sent to the Editor, Iranian Studies, Box E-154, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167, U.S.A. Communications concerning the affairs of the Society should be addressed to the Secretary, The Society for Iranian Studies, P.O. Box 89, Village Station, New York, New York 10014, U.S.A.

Cover design by Tina Kazemi
Price of current issue \$2.50